Dr. Peter Aldag

Jewry in England: A Thousand-Year History

Volume 6: Emancipation (1830-1866)

CAP. LIX.

An Act to relieve Her Majesty's Subjects from certain Penalties and Disabilities in regard to Religious Opinions.

[18th *August* 1846.]

BE it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That from and after the Commencement of this Act the Statutes or Ordinances and the several Acts herein-after mentioned, or so much and such Parts of any of the said Acts as are herein-after specified, shall be repealed; (that is to say,)

Certain Acts and Parts of Acts repealed.

The Statute or Ordinance of the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Years of the Reign of King *Henry* the Third, and the Statute or Ordinance commonly called Statutum Judæismo:

Also so much of an Act passed in the Fifth and Sixth Years of the Reign of King *Edward* the Sixth, intituled *An Act for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of Sacraments throughout the Realm*, as enacts "that from and after the Feast of *All Saints* next coming all and every Person and Persons inhabiting within this Realm, or any other the King's Majesty's Dominions, shall diligently and faithfully,

5 & 6 Edw. 6. c. 1., §§ 1, 2, 3, 4, 6.

Jewry in England: A Thousand-Year History

The volumes of this study:

Volume 1: From the Earliest Years To Expulsion (669-1290)

Volume 2: The Return of the Jews Under Cromwell (1290-1658)

Volume 3: Royal Protectors of the Jews (1658-1714)

Volume 4: Early Emancipation Struggles and Jewish Defeat (1714-1753)

Volume 5: Increasing Influence of the Jews (1754-1830)

Volume 6: Emancipation (1830-1866)

Volume 7: Jewish Domination (1867-1942)

For all front matter see Volume 1.

Volume 6: Contents

Introduction
The Jews' Methodology: The Period from 1830 to 1866
The Number of Jews in the Year 1830
Jewish Preparations and Initial Defeats
The Decisive Battle Begins
The Years 1833–1834
A Jewish Incident: David Salomons
The Battle Continues
Disraeli on the Jewish Race
Ritual Murders in the Orient
David Salomons: City of London Alderman
Salomons Loses, Rothschild Wins
A New Propaganda Campaign
A Repeat of the Rothschild Farce
The Expulsion of Rothschild
For a Second Time: David Salomons
New Battles
Progress and Resistance
Jews and Lords
Judah Has Triumphed
Conclusion
Translator's Appendix: A Sketch of Jewish London in the 1840s
Bibliography

Introduction

[Translator's note: This Introduction is found in Aldag's book *Juden beherrschen England*, a separate publication that was made of Vols. 6 and 7 of *Das Judentum in England*. It has been reproduced here for its literary interest, and for its useful recapitulation of salient points in the preceding volumes.]

It is a pretty much typical peculiarity of the Jewish race that it brings with it, without fail, the seeds of anti-Semitism. Effectively, in every place where the Jewish element manages to impose itself to a considerable extent, anti-Semitism will similarly flourish and activate in a seemingly spontaneous way. It would be an unparalleled historical phenomenon if anything else had happened in England. Already at the dawn of English history, anti-Jewish attitudes can be frequently observed, which countless times are manifested in anti-Semitic revolts and in strong national and racial measures. It is sufficient to recall the expulsion of almost all Jews by Edward I, back in the year 1290, which had such lasting consequences for England. Until then it had been the custom, later re-established, that princes and kings surrounded themselves with Jewish advisors and, above all, were assisted by a Jewish financier. But Edward was one of the few noblemen who put the national interest before all else, even his own economic interests, who listened to the prevailing mood of his people, and who expelled the Jews from the country. The people have known perfectly well, at every stage in history, what to think of Judaism. In those days it had become pretty much evident that certain cases of ritual murder and the devaluation of the currency, as well as usury on money and lands were reasonably due to Jewish machinations; in short, the royal decree was the logical consequence of an openly anti-Semitic attitude in the people.

But this event, despite being huge and consequential in itself, did not go beyond being an episodic act. Cromwell in particular began and energetically consolidated not only the close union of the Jewish element with English national life, but went as far as almost to make English and Jewish political interests indistinguishable. We do not claim, of course, that it would have been possible to classify Cromwell as a philo-Semite or attribute pro-Jewish tendencies to him, far from it: Cromwell was an Englishman and nothing but an Englishman. But diverse factors had obviously made him consider it convenient to turn to and support Judaism.

Let us start with the genuinely fundamental Puritan spirit of belonging to a chosen people who are favoured by God. Who could deny here the great similarity between the appreciation for outward prosperity, economic success and social advancement, and the Jewish ideology of the Old Testament? On comparing the Old Testament with the New, wouldn't the Puritan have to give preference to the first, given its sober and clear ideology which orients its religious aspects towards outward appearances? Wouldn't the history of the people who have been divinely chosen, and therefore, politically chosen, called thus to sovereignty, be more attractive to the English Puritan desirous of world hegemony, than the New Testament doctrine of love, compassion and renunciation?

But dispensing with this purely spiritual aspect, what Cromwell yearned for was not only to give a religious and divine character to English pretensions to hegemony, but even further, to represent and characterise the English people as those directly mandated to carry out the Old Testament's divine will of sovereignty.

But Cromwell would have been a poor Puritan indeed if, as well as using tradition as justification, he had not got out of it the concrete results and material success that he did. With the new wave of Jewish immigration, called to England by the Puritans, came a good part of the connections of world commerce, which already found themselves in Jewish hands, which resulted in what was perhaps England's best ally in the fight against Holland and Spain.

All of this can only be observed and represented here in the most haphazard and vaguely detailed way, and is only directly important for being able to comprehend what came later, because it demonstrates the inner and spiritual similarity between the English Puritan and the Judaism of the Old Testament, the Old Testament coming to play something like the role of an 'allegory of national policy'. Cromwell's death, which undoubtedly left Judaism in an unfavourable and unsatisfactory situation, did very little to change the state of things. The Jewish spirit of chosenness and divine grace continued to live on in countless Englishmen, and only because of this could the Jewish emancipation movement of the nineteenth century take such a fateful turn, and put into Jewish hands such important posts and offices. Immediately after Cromwell the English king returned to being surrounded by influential Jews, to whom were entrusted the main duties of the Court and posts of high responsibility, or, at the very least, he was advised by a Jewish banker. It is true to say that anti-Semitism had still not disappeared. The last bulwark against Jewish emancipation was the House of Lords, until this position was likewise assaulted and destroyed. From that point onwards, it was very rare that true instincts and racial knowledge were made visible and evident, and only religious differences were recognised and stressed.

The following pages tell of the emancipation and show how Judaism did not only come to dominate the racial and national life of England, but also, going beyond this, has been dedicating all of its efforts to the conquest of global hegemony.

The Jews' Methodology: The Period from 1830 to 1866

The year 1830 had arrived. The Jews and their friends had occupied all of the positions that they felt necessary for the general attack. With calm and sangfroid they proceeded to eliminate the last of the restrictions on them, known to history as Jewish disabilities. What type of restrictions were these?

This is a difficult question to answer, since, theoretically, many things were prohibited to Jews that in practice they had enjoyed for already a long time since their resettlement.

There was, for example, the problem of immovable property. Two archaic thirteenth-century laws which had been completely forgotten, but which were unearthed again in 1788, denied Jews the right to possess immovable property. Although these laws remained in effect, due to never having been repealed, very little attention was paid to them, which was why, in the final decades of the seventeenth century, it was not unusual for the Jews to acquire immovable property.[1] Nevertheless, a longstanding and heated debate continued to rage among jurists regarding the validity or otherwise of such acquisitions, and the final word on the matter had still not been pronounced in any sense.

Theoretically, neither did the Jews have the right to vote, given that, although achieving British nationality would mean the first condition for suffrage was met, to be an elector one also had to be a freeholder of immovable property in some county, or citizen of a district, in possession of all of his rights. For that reason, in the face of a lack of clarity regarding the property question, this condition was highly uncertain for the Jews, while the quality of being citizens in possession of full rights had only been granted to them relatively recently – as for example, by the City of London. Nevertheless, omitting this condition, the electoral president could demand of an elector, regarding the support for a candidate of the electoral district, to swear the Oath of Abjuration (in this case, abjuration of loyalty to the Stuart King James II and his descendants), an oath which the Jews could not swear due to the final passage 'upon the true faith of a Christian'. But regardless of these theoretical difficulties, the Jews took part in elections, a situation which continued until the definitive clarification of the problem in the year 1867, when the Jews were granted full electoral rights.[2]

The spheres which were totally forbidden to them included, for example, the profession of barrister (jurisconsult), as well as municipal and other official posts. In addition, it was prohibited for them to enter universities, as it was prohibited for them to become members of Parliament.[3]

The quoted final words of the Oath of Abjuration, that were generally required for the granting of such rights, signified an insurmountable obstacle for the Jews, which is why they strove

---

1 Henriques: *Jews*, pp. 191-194. Translator's note: It is likely that this is a reference to the antiquary D'Blossiers Tovey, who, in the course of research at the Bodleian Library for his 1738 history *Anglia Judaica* [see Translator's Bibliography for a recent English translation of the same], unearthed two unrepealed ordinances prohibiting Jewish land ownership. These ordinances, made under Henry III in 1271 and 1275, arguably undermined the validity of subsequent legislation made in 1723. For further information, see Salbstein, p. 48 [Translator's Bibliography].

2 Henriques: *Jews*, pp. 246-247. Hyamson: *History*, p. 261. Translator's note: Note that some sources use the phrase 'on the true faith of a Christian', while most others use 'upon the true faith of a Christian', an interchangeability which is quite ironic, given the central political importance of these few words over the course of the 19th century. In the interests of consistency, I have opted for the latter formulation unless directly quoting a source which uses the alternate version.

3 Hyamson: *History*, pp. 261-262. Picciotto: p. 386.

to defeat them so determinedly for almost thirty years. Countless petitions were sent to Parliament, and even admitted into it, requesting the abrogation of the oath's formula, to thus make Hebrew admission possible; but equally countless were the denials that these requests merited in the House of Lords. We often find, year after year, Parliament taken up with this question and sometimes several requests of this type took place in the same year. Surely in the history of England there can be no analogous issue that excited such passions. Even though, for example, the Catholic Question was also the subject of discussion for a long time, the arrangement agreed by both legislative Houses in the year 1829 brought a satisfactory solution to all interested parties. Infinitely greater were the amounts of energy, time, effort and money that were employed to help the Jewish Question to triumph. For many years the different electoral assemblies went under the sign of 'for or against Judah'. The parliamentary debates went on for days and even nights, but for twenty-eight years the House of Lords resisted every Jewish assault. In accordance with the British constitution of that time, every law, to acquire legal force, had to be approved by both Houses, the House of Commons and the House of Lords. At the beginning of 1858 the resistance of the Lords still remained unbreakable. What today is not wished to be seen in most spheres of England, threatened to happen: an unprecedented constitutional crisis. In the most irresponsible way, the Jews and their friends fanned the flames in their newspapers against the House of Lords and demanded more or less openly a violent intervention into the rights of the Lords, whose undignified fate can be partly explained by this.

It is truly strange – although it causes no amazement to those familiar with Jewish methods – that the general works on the history of England barely mention these battles and these crises. One finds that famous historians[4] skim over these events in two or three paragraphs, while much less important matters are discussed at length[5], things that to today's average Englishman seem much more important than the Jewish Question, which eats away at his very marrow, yet nevertheless he considers trivial and therefore unworthy of mention. We do not wish to enter into a discussion regarding that attitude here, but it would be interesting to know why the Jews and their friends have struggled for emancipation for almost thirty years, with all of the means imaginable, if it had been such an irrelevant matter. The terrifying ignorance of the matters regarding these historic facts has been the main motivator for us to lay out in the following chapters, with considerable detail, important speeches of the members of Parliament of that time. All of these speeches can be found in Hansard and are therefore beyond all doubt in terms of their authenticity. In addition, we have been able to verify that the content and the form entirely correspond with modern anti-Jewish conceptions, thus conclusively refuting that theory spread around by the Jews of England, that in Great Britain there has never existed powerful anti-Jewish forces. Although these manifestations frequently rest on religious bases and do not strongly highlight the racial factor, the content of these speeches will leave no-one in doubt that the Jews were considered immoral and pernicious for the people.

We will also spend considerable time on the attitude of the press. Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay[6], whose life spanned the epoch 1800-1859 and who has become known principally for

4 Paul: Volume I, pp. 81, 119, 132-3, 212, 287, 351, Volume II, pp. 66, 82, 131, 178. Lingard: Volume II, p. 627. Brodrick: Volume II, p. 235. Low: Volume XII, p. 169. Spencer Walpole: *History of England*, Volume III, p. 77, Volume IV, p. 343. Spencer Walpole: *The History of Twenty-five Years*, Volume I, p. 171.

5 See, for example, Paul: Volume 1, pp. 132-135.

6 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume XII, pp. 410-418. Translator's note: I was unable to find the original English form of this quotation, the closest I could find being from Macaulay's *The History of England from the Accession of James II*, Chapter XXI: 'The history of the newspapers of England from that time to the present day is a most interesting and instructive part of the history of the country.'

his historical works, wrote the sentence: ‘The one true history of a country can only be found in its newspapers.’ While there might be a good deal of truth to this, one has to avoid attributing too much importance to this theory. It is interesting to gauge how the press started dedicating more and more column inches to the Jewish Question, to eventually pass over onto the side of the Jews and their friends.

In this sixth volume of our work we shall carefully expound how the Jews, over a period of time, set about preparing the ground for their goals, back in the years around 1830. Their victory is due in part to the press, which was kind to them and created an atmosphere within the populace which must have been favourable to them. Liberal circles similarly intervened in support of Jewish emancipation, under the banner of general liberty. But it was the organised Jewry of London which did the most work to advance the cause, through money and relationships with powerful politicians.

Behind it all were men of great energy and inexhaustible financial means, such as Lord John Russell and the House of Rothschild, which was headed until 1836 by Nathan Mayer Rothschild, and later mainly by his son Lionel. Lord John Russell was very active for many years in English politics, while Rothschild had the money required. Along with these two one must include Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, who similarly disposed of enormous wealth and had many friends among the aristocracy and the other ruling classes. On seeing that the Jews’ efforts had been unsuccessful in the first years of their fight, he dedicated himself almost exclusively to the emancipation movement and was lucky enough to be able to witness the final victory of his racial brethren, after having been previously elevated to the nobility.[7] The last and by no means least in this alliance was Benjamin Disraeli, who onwards from 1837 – the year of his entry into Parliament – intervened on behalf of the Jews.

It is instructive to say something regarding the Jews’ tactics. After having achieved partial victories in the City, the Jews aimed to achieved their emancipation in one fell swoop, with a bill which would legally abolish all Jewish disabilities. This attempt having failed, they returned to the old methods: overall efforts were divided into isolated actions, to achieve the annulment of one restriction after another, thus definitively overcoming and defeating the general principle of their adversaries. In this way the Jews also managed to gradually occupy positions from which their contributions could support the Jewish Question. The most offensive method consisted of the Jews getting themselves elected for official posts of any type, without being legally entitled to do so. Then they appealed to the popular mood, and, in the case of being excluded, complained of the injustice to the electors and the candidates. We will soon see to what extent this popular mood could interfere in such elections.

We shall also deal at length with the number of Jews in England and their main centres of settlement, which we believe is needed to demonstrate once again, with full evidence, that in all of the great revolutions produced within a nation regarding the Jewish Question, the numerical force of the Children of Israel is never the main factor, but rather the real importance lies solely in certain cliques of rich and influential Jews.

---

7 *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume VI, p. 31. Translator’s note: Goldsmid was the first unbaptised Jew to be given a hereditary title, when he was made baronet in 1841.

The Number of Jews in the Year 1830

The calculations of various researchers regarding the totality of Jews in 1830 do not show uniform conclusions, but the differences are insignificant. One can safely say that in said epoch some 20,000 Jews lived in London, and some 10,000 more in the remainder of England.[8] In 1848 the number of Jews was estimated at 40,000 souls,[9] which stands in contradiction to a calculation made in 1853 which put the figure at 25,000,[10] which also does not seem to accord with the 1830 estimate. This last figure come from the Reverend Mills, who, due to his extensive dealings with the Jews, claimed to have an exact knowledge of their life.[11] Nevertheless, although he may have erred in his rough calculation, one has to forgive him due to the lack of statistics. On the other hand, his statements demonstrate that he was, indeed, very familiar with the Jewish colony of England.

He tells us, for example, that the majority of Jews had to be considered as poor, being constituted of peoples who had immigrated relatively recently and who mainly lived in London. Based on his rough calculation of 25,000, he puts the figure of poor Jews at 12,000 – that is, almost half; another 8,000 are counted to be among the so-called middle class, while the remaining 5,000 must be included, in his judgement, among the wealthy classes. Only this last category should enter into consideration as those able to impose their will on the influential men of England, and it would probably only be a certain few of them – like Rothschild and Goldsmid – who with their riches and their relationships could bend the English government to their will.

We also find out through Mills that already at that time, together with London, the principal centres for Jewish immigration were the industrial cities of Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester.[12]

8 Hyamson: *History*, p. 260. B. Montagu: p. 21. Goldsmid: *Remarks*, p. 26, 69, 70. Salomons: *Short Statement*: p. 21.
9 Egan: p. 36.
10 Mills: p. 256.
11 Mills: *Prologue*, pp. 5, 256-258.
12 Mills: pp. 259-260.

Jewish Preparations and Initial Defeats

In the preparations for their first attempt at emancipation, the documents published by Jews offer us the rare chance to perfectly comprehend the objectives and methodology of Jewish behaviour. It concerns the letters from the estate of the late Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid who played a leading role among the Jews. Unfortunately, only a selection of these letters have been published, while the main body of them continue in Jewish hands.[13] But even this small sample offers us a good glimpse into the secret negotiations of the Jews with England's influential men of the time.

Already in 1828, Lord Holland, in a letter to Goldsmid, is recommending that the final words of the Oath of Abjuration, fatal for Jews, be eliminated by law. He assures him that he will lend all of his weight in the House of Lords to having this position accepted.[14]

Other correspondence between the two, from February 1829, informs of the manoeuvres of Rothschild who – as Lord Holland advised – was to expound to the Duke of Wellington the value to be wrought from looking kindly upon global Jewry. In the face of growing Russian influence in the Middle East, it was indispensable for England to be assured of secret support from the Hebrews who lived there. Lord Holland continued:

> The Jews throughout those eastern countries are an active, intelligent, opulent, and above all compacted and united race – remarkable, as you well know they are everywhere, for a rapid and confidential communication of their sentiments and feelings one to the other, and in possession of many of the most lucrative trades and professions of the country. They must therefore have, and in fact they have, much moral though indirect influence on the councils of the State, and still more on the disposition of the people…

But Jews the world over adjust their attitude to each nation's government according on how the latter treats their racial brethren. 'If then the Jews of England were on an equal footing with all their other fellow-subjects, would not their brethren of Constantinople, Turkey, and the Levant, feel that in promoting the political objects of Great Britain they were furthering the view of a friendly power…?' In view of that, by England showing herself to be generous with the Jews, in Lord Holland's judgement, 'every Jew banker, Jew physician, Jew merchant throughout Turkey, would become an active and useful partisan of the English system of policy in the Levant, whatever that system may be'.[15]

This international cooperation of the Jews with Great Britain, evidently a betrayal of the corresponding host nation – as in this case Turkey – was as a consequence the main reason that, as Rothschild explained to the Duke of Wellington, there was a need to concede an equality of rights to the Jews of England. From our perspective as Germans, we can agree with the following observation: it is very interesting for us and for our measures taken regarding the Jews.

---

13 L. Abrahams: p. 116.
14 L. Abrahams: pp. 134-135.
15 L. Abrahams, pp. 135-137. Translator's note: All Holland quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.

From other letters it can be gleaned that the progress of the law regarding Catholics was closely followed. In an extract from the minute-book of the Board of Deputies for the Affairs of British Jews, dated March 17th, 1829, one reads that Goldsmid held meetings with numerous members of both legislative Houses on the Jewish Question, having also entered into negotiations with figures as important as Lord Holland, Lord Lansdowne and other influential men. It was hoped to gain still greater influence in this sphere through Mr. Moses Montefiore.[16]

In April 1829 it is likely that new steps were taken in favour of the Jews.

We find letters from Lord Holland dated April 11th and 12th addressed to I. L. [Isaac Lyon] Goldsmid, which indicate great general activity. It is interesting to note that 'Mr. R.' – undoubtedly Rothschild – had spoken to 'powerful persons' who were found to be 'friendly to the object… in view'. In addition, it appears to have been verified that the press and the public would show the greatest inclination towards supporting the Jewish Question.[17]

From the minute-book of the Board of Deputies for the Affairs of British Jews, for the session of April 16th, 1829, one gleans that the Duke of Wellington, the Lord Chancellor and other leading government representatives had promised Rothschild all of their support during the course of an interview. We also learn that Rothschild 'strenuously advised that for the present not a single observation should be published in the daily papers on the subject, being convinced that any controversy would prove fatal to the object in view'.[18]

Straight afterwards work began on the bill for the annulment of existing Jewish disabilities. This bill was finished in May of the same year. Its principal demand was equal rights with the English, because the Catholics had been already been granted the same rights. But before taking the formal steps to submit the bill the Duke of Wellington was once again asked if he was still ready to lend his support to the cause. It must surely have been an unpleasant surprise for the Jews to have heard Wellington's negative reply, which was based on the fact that regarding the Catholic emancipation law he felt that it was bad timing to launch another analogous bill for another group in the population, because at that point one had to consider the violent attacks that would come from public opinion. When even Lord Holland seconded the Duke of Wellington's opinion, the next step of the plan was cancelled.[19]

Nevertheless, it was decided undesirable to delay the plan for more than a few months. Already at the end of June we find a letter from Lord Holland to I. L. Goldsmid recommending the plausibility of future moves. It indicates the need to win over a high church dignitary in the House of Lords, to win over the support of this group known not to be very favourable to Jewish emancipation. It considers the Bishop of London very suitable to this end and recommends that they begin to work on him appropriately, by way of Lord Bexley.[20]

---

16 L. Abrahams: pp. 139-140. Translator's note: Note that here the Board of Deputies' official name is as it appears in the original source, bearing in mind that the organisation has had different official names over the centuries.

17 L. Abrahams, pp. 140-141. Translator's note: Quoted elements from original source. As with this and all future mentions of I. L. Goldsmid in this volume, Aldag's Roman-script German text has rendered the name as J. L. Goldsmid, an error likely due to a fault in transcription from the original Fraktur [Gothic] script of the text (I's and J's being extremely similar to the casual glance); a careful checking of Aldag's primary sources show that only I. L. [i.e. Isaac Lyon] Goldsmid is the individual in question. The English translation has thus amended all errors accordingly. This is of particular importance to mention due to the fact that a J. L. Goldsmid also did exist around the same time, being Isaac's second cousin, and he similarly used double initials for his forenames [John Louis].

18 L. Abrahams: p. 141. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. See also Emanuel, p. 16 ff. for complete reports of these 1829 meetings.

19 L. Abrahams: pp. 141-144. Emanuel: pp. 16-20.

20 L. Abrahams: pp. 144-145.

From what it would appear, some time later Lord Holland established an exact plan for subsequent negotiations, as we find notes in his handwriting which indicate this. It can be seen that he set out the matter of whether the Jews' immediate demand should be a partial or total equality of rights, and whether they wanted to present their bill first to the House of Lords or to the Commons. In his judgement, one had to consider very carefully the political party to which the sponsor of the bill would belong, in order to maximise the chance of success.

He then expresses his own opinion and ends by suggesting that the best option would be that the proposition is made by a government minister, or – in the case of not finding one prepared to do it – by a bishop. Failing that, 'some member of character who voted against the Roman Catholic Relief Bill' should be sought.[21]

Apparently, the Earl of Glengall must have another of the 'friends of the Jews', who made propaganda designed to promote the desired law, since in a letter addressed to I. L. Goldsmid he tells him that his efforts with Lord Hertford in this direction seem to have borne fruit.[22]

Halfway through September 1829, support was also secured from the Catholic Radical MP, Daniel O'Connell. O'Connell, who with great drive had led the Catholic Question to victory,[23] showed himself very inclined to help the Jews, whom he saw as oppressed, as was expressed in his letter dated September 11th, 1929 to I. L. Goldsmid. He particularly emphasised that the Jews should force Parliament to take a decision in the face of a *fait accompli*. In a letter to Goldsmid, O'Connell wrote:

> You ought not to confide in English liberality. It is a plant not genial to the British soil. It must be *forced*. It requires a *hot-bed*. The English were always persecutors. Before the so-styled Reformation the English tortured the Jews and strung up in scores the Lollards. After that Reformation they still roasted the Jews and hung the Papists…[24]

Shortly before the bill was presented to Parliament in 1830, the member Robert Grant, who had been chosen to present the motion, wrote that certain members harboured doubts about the definitive position that they should take regarding the Jewish Question [*idem*. pp. 155-156].

It is unfortunate that, of Isaac Lyon Goldsmid's abundant correspondence, only this small part has been published up until now. This is particularly inconvenient due to the fact that, according to another Jewish source, among the collection in question there are numerous letters from Lord Lansdowne, Lord Melbourne, Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington, Earl Grey and many other influential men of the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Letters from Lord Lyndhurst – who was then Lord Chancellor – attest to the fact that this man was wholeheartedly on the side of the Jews and that he was totally prepared to use all of his influence in the service of their cause. As a member of the government, naturally, when it came to voting he had no other option but to vote in the same direction as the cabinet, but that did not in any way affect his stance towards the issue.[25]

---

21 L. Abrahams: pp. 145-151. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
22 L. Abrahams: p. 151.
23 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume XIV: p. 816.
24 L. Abrahams: pp. 151-153. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
25 Marks: p. 32.

Through all of the above one can see how, in the shadows, many years of effort and work went into making the final preparations. Here also we can see the game, so often suspected and so rarely admitted to by the Jews, of one or more of their ethnic brethren making use of the high dignitaries of a country in order to achieve their ends. It is difficult for the members of the legislative Houses, and much less the public, to imagine the closeness of the relationship between their leading men and the Jews, and what is more, that certain moves were made by these men only after being approved by the Jews. Unfortunately, in none of the emancipation attempts of the subsequent years did this game of intrigues come to be exposed. What is certain is that the I. L. Goldsmid collection and the Rothschild archive could shed light on this matter. In the meantime, we will have to wait for the time in which this mystery can be finally solved.

Eventually, the moment arrived at which it was considered opportune to mount the general offensive. For years, the enemy's positions had been gradually undermined, and the City, previously its more solid bulwark, not only had fallen, but had even turned into the hub of the Jews' allies. The number of those from the highest spheres of life who had become supporters of the Jewish cause was now legion. As a consequence, there had never been a more favourable time to achieve victory.

The Decisive Battle Begins

On April 5th, 1930, Robert Grant introduced a bill ‘to repeal the civil disabilities affecting British-born subjects professing the Jewish religion’.[26]

In his speech, interesting for the history of Jews in England, Grant enumerated all of the circumstances which went in favour of his proposal for new legislation. To support his thesis he made use of, among other things, the idea that the times were now sufficiently modern to end with the injustices committed against the Jews over centuries. He asserted that the restrictions were in no way justified, that the Jews had always submitted themselves to the interest of the country, and that what had been conceded to the Catholics likewise had to be granted to the 30,000-40,000 Jews of England. In his long statement, he also touched upon the arguments that were expected from the Opposition, which asserted that, regarding the Jews, ‘there was something so demoralising in the state of some of their body that they were not fit to be invested with civil privileges’. He admitted that this accusation was justified in the case of a certain few, but untrue with regards to most, and that there was not, in the whole of the land, citizens who distinguished themselves as much as the upper echelons of Jewry in terms of integrity, unimpeachability and elevated sentiments. He agreed that the Opposition’s accusation had a basis in fact regarding the lower classes, but he had to consider that, at the moment that the restrictions were abolished through the law he demanded, such a triumphal social evolution would take place that it would put an end to, once and for all, every accusation made against the Jews as a collective.[27]

Next spoke the then main spokesman of the Opposition, Sir Robert Inglis. With eloquent and bitter words he attacked the bill.

According to the Hansard report of Inglis’ speech regarding the Jews:

> It appeared to him that there was nothing in their character, conduct, history, or present condition, which justified the appeal that had been made. He maintained that the Jews were aliens, not in the technical and legal sense, when Lord Coke called them ‘aliens and perpetual enemies’, but in the popular sense of the word: they were aliens because their country and their interests were not merely different, but hostile to our own. The Jews of London had more sympathy with the Jews resident in Berlin or Vienna than with Christians among whom they resided – and a reference to a few instances would show that their interests were different and hostile. In one of the wars of the last century the Jews were expelled from Bohemia for assisting an invading army, and it was well known that they importantly facilitated the retreat of Napoleon after his campaign in Russia: they furnished the means to those who were lucky enough to escape. It was a known fact also, that while we were at war with France, the Jews of London had furnished Napoleon with a loan to enable him to carry on the most determined hostility.

Hansard reports that Sir Robert Inglis went on to give other analogous examples, before he went on to say the following:

---

26 Henriques: *Jews*, p. 265. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
27 *Hansard*, Volume 23, p. 1298. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

> … but the Jews might get into the House of Commons, and use that power for their own selfish and unnational purposes. They were not a sect; but to this day they called themselves a people; and they might avail themselves of their political influence for objects connected with their own aggrandisement… The Jews might obtain admission by the same means [bribery] and for the same purposes [self-interest], and an honourable friend of his had said, that he knew of four who were ready to enter the House at once: considering that there were in the United Kingdom, at the utmost, 40,000 Jews, and that about every 40,000 Christians had only one representative, this number was considerably above their fair proportion. The command of capital would enable the Jews to obtain seats, and the introduction of a Jew ought to be considered direct evidence of bribery, for it was out of the question to suppose that they would ever obtain the unbought suffrages of the people. A Jew Member would carry on his forehead the evidence of the mode by which he obtained admission…

Sir Robert ended his speech with the declaration that in no way should the Jews be admitted to Parliament.[28]

Another member, the aforementioned Macaulay, voted for the bill out of 'moral obligation'.[29] Mr. Harrison Batley warned the Parliament that, if the bill were passed, 'twenty-five Jews would obtain seats in the Commons House of Parliament, and a few of the leading men amongst them would soon obtain as much influence there as they already had already possessed over the 3 percent Consols'.[30] Another member of Parliament, Sir James Macintosh, declared himself, in turn, a supporter of the bill. He agreed, of course, that the Jews were a degraded people, but that this was due to the fact that they were openly despised. The moral inferiority of their character came solely from the oppression that they had long suffered, he added; it was necessary to give them rights and allow them to educate their children well, and this would undoubtedly lead to them to become better people.[31] The Chancellor of the Exchequer also intervened with a long speech, in favour of the Jews' adversaries. He attacked the defenders of the bill, according to whom it was unjust to deny the Jews the same rights as the Catholics. As Hansard reports of his closing remarks:

> There was this difference between the Jews and the Catholics – that the Catholics had shed their blood for us – they had fought our battles both by sea and land – they had swelled the force of our fleets and our armies, and there was a good reason why we should not make enemies of those who had served us, and who amounted to seven million people. But the Jews had not fought our battles – they had not served in our armies and navy, and they did not amount, it was stated by a writer of their own nation, to more than 27,000 persons. The arguments which applied to the Roman Catholics, seemed to him, therefore, to have no application to the Jews.[32]

28 *Hansard*, Volume 23, p. 1303 ff. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
29 *Hansard*, Volume 23, p. 1308. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
30 *Hansard*, Volume 23, p. 1314.
31 *Hansard*, Volume 23, pp. 1314-23.
32 *Hansard*, Volume 23, pp. 1323-5. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

At the first reading there was a majority of 18 votes in favour of the bill.[33]

The discussion in Parliament showed that a latent fire had been burning for some time, which, naturally, was countered by the Jews' adversaries, using all means at their disposal. The press was also brought into the polemics. It first showed itself to be quite moderate, until the great campaigns of 1847 exposed the chasm between the two opposing ideologies surrounding the Jewish Question.

The *Public Ledger* of April 6th, 1830 and the *Spectator* of April 10th of the same year, quote Grant's bill and opine that the problem of Jewish emancipation should be resolved as soon as possible. The *Standard* of the 6th April is similarly quite indecisive. Only the *Times* directly attacks the Jews in an article dated May 3rd. Among other things, it stated the following [reproduced verbatim from the original source]:

> The Jews are not, cannot be, component parts of any nation: their civil, their religious institutions forbid any such amalgamation. They are, however scattered, however distant from each other, not only, in the language of their own sacred volume, 'a peculiar people,' but a separate nation. They cannot have, they must not have, any identity of political interest with any people but their own.
>
> [...]
>
> Everything short of political identification should be granted; but that, in the nature of things, cannot be granted, because a Jew cannot be a patriotic Frenchman, or German, or Englishman, till he has put off his character of Jew.
>
> [...]
>
> More than a third of the seats in Parliament are notoriously purchasable, and a few years might convert a British House of Commons into a Jewish Sanhedrin…

These are truly harsh words for the Jews and their friends, which is why the bill's second reading was awaited with mixed feelings, even more so given that the majority of the first reading had been very marginal.

But the Jews and their friends did not stay inactive and made full use of all of their influence on public opinion. Alongside the presentation of the bill they brought a petition from part of the electorate of Liverpool in favour of the Jews; the two thousand signatures proceeding mainly from bankers and merchants.[34] As is known, Liverpool was one of the centres of Judaism in the provinces, so we can suppose that under such a circumstance not a few of the petitioners must have been baptised Jews, non-baptised Jews, half-Jews, friends of Jews, and people who were dependant on Jews.

But for the second reading it was decided to give an even greater show of public opinion to Parliament. For this a second petition was brought, this time from what had come to be, at least, a bulwark of Judaism – the City of London. This petition contained some 14,000 signatures, also

33 *Hansard*, Volume 23, p. 1336.
34 Egan: p. 37.

almost exclusively from bankers, merchants and academics – between them eleven directors of the Bank of England, 1,100 doctors, many lawyers and thousands of influential men.[35]

With great participation from all of the interested parties, the moment of the second reading arrived. Lord Belgrave believed that Jews had to be denied an equality of rights, because they were an international people and therefore incapable of all patriotic sentiment.[36] Sir E. Deering didn't want them to be excluded from official posts, but he did want them excluded, without exception, from Parliament.[37] Sir Robert Peel also voted against the bill, because the bill did not include the Quaker sects nor the separatists.[38] All of Lord John Russell's art of oratory[39] was not enough to convince the Jews' adversaries, which is why the bill was defeated by 228 votes to 165.[40]

The consternation in the Jewish camp was great, but not so much that they abandoned their sought-after objective, as was shown by an event which took place in Parliament shortly afterwards.

Between the first and second reading of the aforementioned bill, the Jew Levi had arranged to have a motion tabled which called for clarification on the matter of whether or not it was legal for the Jews to acquire immovable property. His petition had even been supported by the Attorney-General.[41] When, further onwards, a decision was required to be taken, the member Robert Grant declared himself against, giving the reason that 'one would have to grant the Jews all of the rights or none, which was why he would not vote in favour of any partial solution'.[42]

As can be seen, the Jews still felt strong enough to pursue a full equality of rights with an open frontal attack. Of course, everything had progressed in the shadows according to the agenda, but, as had already happened once, sufficient attention had not been paid to the public mood. The first failed attempt had clearly demonstrated that the popular mood was not yet remotely propitious to the Jews' desires. It was necessary to do something that would create a change, something which would be achieved, preferably, through the 'enlightenment of the ignorant masses'. As a consequence, possession was taken of every possible means of propaganda[43], and it was to this that the Jews largely owed their successes in the nineteenth century.

They began by printing the speeches made in Parliament in favour of Jewish emancipation, then distributing them immediately in large print runs. Various famous authors were commissioned to write pamphlets and bulletins in favour of the Jews. The selection was made very carefully, with the result that their efforts began to pay off handsomely. The first author to write an article of this nature, in the *Edinburgh Review* of 1831, was the aforementioned and (at the time) famous Macaulay; in his article he stated, in accordance with philosophic principles, that Jews had to be admitted into Parliament; that they already had such power in the country that they could not rise any higher; that Jews could not be held responsible for any potential lack of patriotism, as this could be seen as the consequence of treating them badly.[44] Jews known to the public also wielded the pen. Of these we will only mention the two most important: Barnard van Oven and F. H.

---

35 *Hansard*, Volume 95, p. 1385.
36 *Hansard*, Volume 24, p. 786-7.
37 *Hansard*, Volume 24, p. 791.
38 *Hansard*, Volume 24, p. 802.
39 *Hansard*, Volume 24, p. 797.
40 *Hansard*, Volume 24, pp. 812 and 814.
41 *Hansard*, Volume 24, 236-237.
42 *Hansard*, Volume 25, 429. Translator's note: This reference appears to be erroneous.
43 Shapira: p. 50. Marks p.34.
44 Shapira: p. 64.

[Francis Henry] Goldsmid, the second son of I. L. [Isaac Lyon] Goldsmid.[45] The latter particularly was greatly distinguished for his writings. He discussed at length the reasons expounded by Jewish adversaries in Parliament and sought to demonstrate, among other things, that the last words of the Oath of Abjuration were not directed in the slightest at the Jews and for that reason could not be applied to them,[46] nor was it just to grant an equality of rights to the Catholics and deny them to the Jews.[47] He asserted that the English were the only ones responsible for Jewish behaviour, which at times was reprehensible, due to always having treated the Jews badly;[48] that it was ridiculous to speak of a Jewish danger, when only some 30,000 Jews lived in the country, of whom perhaps only three or four would end up as members of Parliament.[49] In another article he informed readers that the twelve MPs of the City and the other London districts had voted unanimously in Parliament in favour of the Jewish law;[50] that it was not true that the Jews of England ever wanted to return to Palestine, rather, they only rejected living like slaves among the English.[51] Goldsmid also seems assured that total victory would soon be achieved, when at the end of his arguments he rejects all compromise and demands full equality of rights alongside the English.[52]

It was reported that this propaganda had the desired effect,[53] which must be true in part, given that on the opposing side no measures were taken which are worthy of mention.

In the following years, English political public opinion was so taken up with parliamentary reforms that it was likely the reason that the Jewish Question remained relegated to second place. But this period must have been quite agreeable to the Jews, as they could use this time to make new, detailed plans for a new bill.

At the beginning of 1832, a new law granted total emancipation to the Jews of Canada.[54] The Jews did not delay in demanding the same right in the Empire's mother country. Perhaps this fact also helped them, in January of the following year, to win a not-insignificant success – admission to the Bar.

The four barrister associations – called Inns of Court – had up until that point denied the admission of Jews and still demanded in 1830 the complete Oath of Abjuration. In 1833 the aforementioned F. H. Goldsmid was the first Jew to present a petition to be admitted to Lincoln's Inn, and allowed into the courtroom, with authorisation not to have to pronounce the last words of the oath. Some members of Parliament opposed the request. When it was shown to the MP Lord Campbell that this was a hardship for the young Jew, due to having allowed him to study in the Inn, Campbell exclaimed: 'Hardship? No hardship at all! Let him become a Christian, and be d——d to him!'[55] Nevertheless, the request was passed by a majority, and on January 30th, 1833 the first Jew was admitted to the Bar.[56]

---

45 Shapira: p. 67.
46 F. H. Goldsmid: *Remarks*, p. 9.
47 F. H. Goldsmid: *Remarks*, pp. 14-15.
48 F. H. Goldsmid: *Remarks*, pp. 18-20.
49 F. H. Goldsmid: *Remarks*, pp. 26-29.
50 F. H. Goldsmid: *Arguments*, p. 4.
51 F. H. Goldsmid: *Arguments*, p. 10.
52 F. H. Goldsmid: *Arguments*: p. 27.
53 Marks: p. 36.
54 F. H. Goldsmid: *Reply*, p. 31.
55 *Lives of the Chancellors*: Volume V, p. 544. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
56 Admission Register no. 19, folio 65. *Records of Lincolns Inn*, Volume II, p. 127. Hyamson: *History*, p. 262. Picciotto: p. 396.

The oath was sworn by F. H. Goldsmid in a form which was possible for him as a Jew,[57] and the remaining three Inns were not long to follow suit in admitting Jews.[58]

This success must not be considered a small feat, for the profession of barrister enjoys great prestige in England and is a condition for becoming a judge and occupying top offices of state. As a result, the Jews had managed to conquer another position, achieving thus a new base for their general attack.

The Jews must have considered this partial success as a good sign, because in the meantime they once more hammered out plans for a new bill. Indeed, the time had never felt as right.

In January 1833 the recently reformed Parliament met for the first time. The Whigs, whose help the Jews continued to count on, had no less than 511 members in the House of Commons, while the Conservatives, on the contrary, had not even 150. F. H. Goldsmid addressed an open letter to the new House of Commons, expressing the hope that the Reformed Parliament would mark the commencement of its career with ‘an act of justice’.[59]

57 Marks: pp. 13-4.
58 Henriques: *Jews.…*, pp. 203-4.
59 Marks: pp. 37-43. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source (p. 43).

The Years 1833–1834

On the 17th of April, 1823, Robert Grant, who meanwhile had come to occupy the highest office in Lord Grey's government,[60] proposed a motion requesting a committee be named to study the existing restrictions on Jews [Jewish disabilities]. Despite protests from Sir Robert Inglis, this motion was passed without a subsequent vote.[61] The name of this MP is often found in the course of the ensuing battles for emancipation, for which reason we should say something about his personality.

Sir Robert Inglis was born in London in the year 1786. After a rigorous education, he dedicated himself almost exclusively to politics and in Parliament always represented the Conservative position. He was considered the representative of the opinions which prevailed in the countryside and – perhaps only for this reason – he was not considered to be of particularly great ability.[62]

Without difficulty, Grant introduced the Jews' Civil Disabilities Bill to Parliament and effortlessly managed to gain a majority at the first reading.[63]

On the 22nd of May, Parliament proceeded to the second reading. Once again it was Sir Robert Inglis who warned against the consequences, negative in every way, that would result from the passing of such a law.[64] He was passionately supported by Sir Oswald Mosley – the great-grandfather of the current head of the Fascists of England.[65] The friends of the Jews, on the other hand, considered the refusal as incompatible with England's liberal principles and with the Jews' brilliant qualities.[66] What had been expected, happened: the second reading took place with a majority of 107 votes.[67] It goes without saying that the third reading similarly found the majority required, in itself unimportant.[68] This victory was undoubtedly due in no small part to the contributions of the Goldsmids, father and son, for while the latter with his publications created endless propaganda for the Jewish cause, the father was continually in negotiations with influential people. It was said that he could be seen every afternoon in the corridors of Parliament, talking to the members who came and went, explaining to them the benefits that would accrue from the passing of the Jewish bill. The following small anecdote is demonstrative of his Jewish zeal:

---

60 Marks: p. 38.

61 *Hansard*, Third Series, Volume 15, pp. 310, 559; Volume 16, p. 10 ff., 725, 775, 973.

62 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume 10, pp. 443-4.

63 *Hansard*, Volume 17, pp. 205-244.

64 *Hansard*, Volume 18, p. 47 ff. Translator's note: In the course of his speech, Inglis brought up the fact that no synagogue or religious Jew had pushed for emancipation, and he quoted Rabbi Joseph Crool, who had campaigned against Jewish emancipation in Britain. Crool believed that the Jews' mission was to remain as 'strangers and sojourners' in foreign lands, and that emancipation would lead to assimilation (and thereby destruction of the Jews *qua* Jews). In this, Crool shared an analogous view to Rabbi Schneur Zalman of Liadi and others who had opposed Napoleon's Jewish emancipation. Modern historiography has painted Crool as poorly educated and eccentric (i.e. of ideas not worthy of serious consideration), and yet events in the subsequent century may argue the wisdom of his case better than the *Jewish Encyclopedia* and others would care to admit. Readers may also be bemused to know that Google has classified one of the Hebrew scholar's books on the topic, *The Fifth Empire* (1829), as 'Antisemitism'.

65 *Hansard*, Volume 18, p. 56. Translator's note: Among the things, Moseley feared that such a law 'would open the flood-gates of ultra-toleration upon the Legislature of the land' and 'the House would be Christian only nominally, and not in reality, and would inflict an irreparable injury upon the institutions of the country'.

66 *Hansard*, Volume 18, p. 51 ff.

67 *Hansard*, Volume 18, p. 56.

68 *Hansard*, Volume 19, p. 1075 ff.

> On one occasion, when it was uncertain whether the Bill would come on in the House of Commons so late in the evening, a conversation between two members pledged to support it was overheard to the following effect.
>
> A: 'There is little chance of the Jews' Bill coming on at this late hour of the night: I shall go home!'
>
> B: 'I should like to do the same, but it is useless to attempt it: there's Goldsmid keeping watch in the lobby, and he'll be sure to press me to wait on the chance.'[69]

There was no rest after the triumph that had just been won, given that for it to have legal validity it still needed the approval of the House of Lords. The leaders of the Jews and their loyalists approached the various Peers and tried to win their support. Lord Holland even managed to get various members of the royal family to declare their support, which they demonstrated at the division in the House of Lords. All possible efforts were made to win over the high church dignitaries, and indeed, success was achieved with the Bishop of Dublin.[70]

August 1st, 1833 marked the moment of the decisive sitting in the House of Lords.

As an obvious proof of power, it was permitted that the Duke of Sussex be the first to take the floor, and he had in his hands 7,000 signatures from Westminster requesting the ratification of the bill. Next, Lord Bexley, I. L. Goldsmid's close associate, formally tabled the motion to request a second reading.[71] The Archbishop of Canterbury was the first to take the floor for the other side. He stated that he respected the Jews' religion and morality, but that Parliament was a Christian institution, something that was not lost on the Jews.[72] The Bishop of Chichester, on the other hand, supported the motion, as for him the Jews were nothing else but the elder brothers of the Christian faith.[73] But when the Duke of Wellington declared himself to be against the bill,[74] which he said was at odds with the Christian character of the country, the bill's fate was sealed, and it was defeated by a large majority.[75]

Angst and mourning reigned in the Israel camp, the fact of which could not be hidden in the article published in the *Times* of August 2nd, which had been circulated in the meantime around the Jews and their allies. In the article, it was stated that the bill had been defeated, but that in the next session they would bring another and it would yield a better result. By contrast, the *Morning Post* of the same date applauded the previous day's events in the House of Lords, and continued in the same vein:

---

69 Marks: p. 45. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

70 Shapira: p. 81.

71 *Hansard*, Volume 20, p. 221; Egan: p. 39. Translator's note: See also Chapter 4 of Salbstein for details of I. L. Goldsmid's prominence and militancy in the Jewish emancipation movement, and the contrast of opinion with Moses Montefiore, who preferred a gradualist, or 'stealth' approach to achieving the same goals. In Montefiore's view: 'The Jew must, in his claims and wishes, not outstrip the age. Let him advance slowly but steadily; let him gradually accustom his Christian fellow-citizens to his gradual progress and success in public life, and what may not be obtainable even by an arduous struggle, will, after a certain time, fall into his lap like ripe fruit.' [p. 86, Salbstein, Translator's Bibliography].

72 *Hansard*, Volume 20, p. 222 ff.

73 *Hansard*, Volume 20, p.238. Translator's note: Readers may find themselves reminded of Pope John Paul II's famous 1987 description of the Jews as 'our elder brothers in the faith of Abraham'.

74 *Hansard*, Volume 20, p. 245.

75 *Hansard*, Volume 20, p. 249.

> It has never yet been shown how a Hebrew, professing to adhere to the religion of his nation, can consistently with that profession avail himself of the privileges which it was proposed to grant. Such a Jew must, we think, consider himself, if he be consistent and conscientious, an alien in this country, and refuse the offer of admission to participate actively in our national institutions whenever that offer shall be made…
>
> [Reproduced verbatim from original source.]

In any case, it will surprise no-one that the Jews, despite their failure, had already decided by November 18th, 1833, under the chairmanship of I. L. Goldsmid, to make new formal moves in Parliament.[76] But not before spring, April 24th, 1834, did Grant table a motion.[77] Once again the usual speeches took place for and against the bill, which passed easily though the House of Commons[78] and was sent up to the House of Lords.

Again the Jews failed.[79] During the debates the Earl of Malmesbury[80] warned that if the law were passed then one would have to admit not only Jews, but also Mohammedans, and the Archbishop of Canterbury[81] was very annoyed that a Jewish bill had been put back on the order paper for discussion.

The results showed the Jews and their friends that the opposition, despite their many preparations, was still too strong for the Jewish Question to be resolved in one fell swoop. For the next ten years, they therefore returned to their original method of achieving emancipation in stages or, as it might be better said, using the law of attrition.

---

76 Coles: p. 1. Translator's note: The chairmanship in question was of the Association for obtaining for British Jews Civil Rights and Privileges [Marks, p. 154].
77 *Hansard*, Volume 22, pp. 1372-3.
78 *Hansard*, Volume 22, p. 1176. Volume 24, p. 382.
79 *Hansard*, Volume 24, p. 731
80 *Hansard*, Volume 24, p. 722.
81 *Hansard*, Volume 24, p. 724 ff.

A Jewish Incident: David Salomons

Already by the following year the correctness of this tactic was proven, and it brought the Jews to a new victory: their ethnic kinsman David Salomons – whom we will frequently encounter from now on – was elected Sheriff of London and Middlesex, which did not only have the character of a municipal district, but also of a county. From the year 1828, as was commonly known, a law existed according to which everyone who took up a such a post had to swear a solemn declaration before entering into the exercise of his functions, a declaration which was impossible for the Jews due to its final words, which were so disastrous for them.

In the election of Salomons this general situation had not been forgotten: both the electors and the elected knew perfectly well that a Jew could not legally occupy the position. Nevertheless – perhaps precisely because of that – he was voted for in order for the law to be invoked, which would in turn obligate Parliament and the House of Lords to make a decision.

David Salomons refused, as was to be expected, to swear the oath that was demanded of him, with the consequence that he was not admitted to the office of sheriff.

From what can be deduced, everything had been carefully prepared for the Jewish counter-coup; the government immediately got involved with the matter and, under the direction of Lord John Russell and Attorney-General Lord John Campbell, introduced a special bill to make it possible for David Salomons to take up his post.

One must not suppose that this bill talked about the case in question or talked generally about Jewish disabilities regarding the swearing of the oath; nor could the word 'Jew' be found in it, and nor did it mention London. The bill's title, also completely unspecific, read:

> An Act for removing Doubts as to the Declaration to be made and Oaths to be taken by Persons appointed to the Office of Sheriff of any City or Town, being a County of itself.[82]

It really is amazing to see how this was done. There could be no room for doubt, especially when, with a law having been passed in 1828 [the Sacramental Test Act 1828 (9. Geo. IV, c. 17), which replaced the Test Act of 1673], everyone knew that the Jews could not swear the oath in its established form. With many complicated clauses that a layman is barely capable of understanding, this law was designed to allow the Jews to forego the oath on taking up municipal positions. It should have been obvious to any discerning legislator that, if this bill were passed, while it would not bring the Jews the complete emancipation they desired, it would nevertheless move them closer to their goal. But the most important thing was that, were the bill made law, the general exclusionary principle would be abandoned, and the friends of the Jews would be able to point to this exception for future cases. In other words, a principle of such transcendental significance could tolerate absolutely no exception if it wasn't to end up completely undermined, and effectively destroyed forever.

---

82 *Statutes of the United Kingdom*, Volume 75, pp. 127-8. Translator's note: This is the original English title of the legislation, as found in *Journals of the House of Commons*, (Volume 90, p. 543), where it is also seen in an abbreviated form as the Sheriffs' Declaration Bill (p. 498).

It is therefore completely incomprehensible why the opposition did not fight this with all of the means available. Were they deceived by the form given to the bill? Or did they believe that they could afford to take a liberal stance as they considered themselves strong enough to be able to withstand a future bid at general emancipation? Or was the bill considered too insignificant to be a threat to the general principle? Today, on analysing the outcome, we know that this stance was the greatest and most irreparable of the errors committed in the fight against the Jewish agenda. In any dispute with them one must maintain the principle of 'everything or nothing', as it is a given that the 'something' invariably leads to 'everything' and is the beginning of the end. It is interesting to see the extreme rapidity with which the law was passed by the various parties required to ensure that a bill could become valid legislation:

On July 23rd, 1835, the bill was presented to Parliament and already by the following day it had passed to the first reading.[83]

On July 29th, the second reading took place, after a debate on the bill had previously taken place in a 'Committee of the whole House',[84] and on August 3rd it was given definitive approval in the House of Commons.[85] In the almost unbelievable speed of ten days, it passed through the House of Lords, normally so hostile, and on August 21st the king gave the Royal Assent, a required formality.[86]

But the rapidity of the process is not the only remarkable thing. The press barely gave it any attention, and, despite the most careful research, Hansard,[87] generally an extremely trustworthy source, does not give us the smallest detail either on any of the debates or on the voting, which leads to the conclusion that the Jews' opponents, for some unknown reason, did nothing to stop the law being passed.

As soon as the law came into effect, Salomons took possession of his new office, in which he was followed two years later by his ethnic kinsman Moses Montefiore.[88]

The tactic of separating the struggle from the general principle and limiting it solely to limited domains and people had shown itself to be effective. It could be expected, then, that new victories would be won in this way, which is why, on November 18th, 1835, the same David Salomons managed to get elected to the post of Alderman of the City of London.

As had happened previously, Salomons could not take possession of his post, access to which was still controlled by the 1828 ordinance, given that the recently passed law only covered an oath modification for the post of sheriff.

On December 3rd, 1835, accompanied by numerous electors, Salomons presented himself at the Court of Aldermen, to be officially appointed to his post.[89] There he was advised that he had to swear the oath provided by the law of 1828, which he rejected in the same way as when he had gone for the first time to be admitted as sheriff. The Court of Aldermen did not accede to any degree of negotiation and declared his election null and void. A new election was announced and another candidate presented. Salomons protested against this new alderman with the aim of

---

83 *Journals of the House of Commons,* Volume 90, pp. 482, 484.
84 *Journals of the House of Commons,* Volume 90, p. 498.
85 *Journals of the House of Commons,* Volume 90, p. 504.
86 *Journals of the House of Commons,* Volume 90, pp. 543, 578.
87 *Hansard,* Volumes 29 and 30.
88 Hyamson: *History*, p. 263. Henriques: *Jews*, pp. 253-4. Picciotto: pp. 391-2. Wolf: *Essays*: p. 314. Egan: p. 45.
89 Britannicus: p. 7.

showing that his election was not valid. But the court judgement recognised that the opinion of the Court of Aldermen was in line with the law and that the second election was legally valid.[90]

Not long after his defeat, Salomons expressed in an article that, for the Jews, it was more important to know that the people chose to elect them than the fact that the Court of Aldermen rejected them, which meant that the fight would continue on despite everything.

90 Henriques: *Jews.…*, pp. 254-5. Hyamson: *History.…*, p. 263.

The Battle Continues

In July of 1836, the Chancellor of the Exchequer presented a new bill for the general annulment of Jewish disabilities. For this attempt, the last days of Parliament were cunningly chosen, because of it being known that at such a point the members were already pretty tired of debates, especially when summer had already begun, and the majority of members were beginning to leave Parliament prematurely to begin their holidays in the spa resorts. There is no other way to explain why the debate was held in an uninterested, almost empty House, where the law was passed by only 39 to 17 votes.[91] The action was still fruitless, however, because in the face of the Government's contrarian attitude, it did not even get as far as a second reading in the House of Lords.

The lack of interest in the Jews' previous attempt must have been crueller for them than failing due to violent opposition, as it was said that they had felt this defeat as 'a crushing blow'.[92] Nevertheless, already by the following year we see Judah get back to work once more. Parliamentary elections were held and what nobody would have believed possible happened: a Jew – once again David Salomons – stood in Shoreham as a candidate. But this time the majority of the constituency's electorate rejected his candidacy.[93] It was considered insolence on Salomons' part to aspire to an office to which he had no legal right.

For this reason, it is instructive to see the warning made publicly by the opposing victorious candidate, Sir Charles Burrell, during a parliamentary debate, which reveals that Salomons had practised intolerable electoral pressure tactics:

> Truth obliged him to add, however, that the supporters of Mr. Salomons were, with few exceptions, of an inferior class in the social scale; how their votes were obtained, he would not say. The conduct of Mr. Salomons' supporters during the election was not at all creditable to them.[94]

On the other hand, with the already cited election of Moses Montefiore as Sheriff of London, the Jews felt re-energised. During the solemn banquet held to celebrate Montefiore's appointment, the Attorney-General, latterly Lord Campbell, who was also present, gave a speech in which he expressed his joy at the election outcome and gave assurances that the government would do everything in its power to grant Jews full equality:

> I am happy to say that the ancient prejudices founded on difference of religious belief are fast wearing away, and I hope the time is at hand when objections on such grounds will altogether cease to operate. It is the desire of Her Majesty's Government to promote such a state of things by all the means in their power. For my part, my opinion

91 *Hansard*, Volume 35, pp. 865 ff., 1209, 1216, 1318.
92 Shapira: p. 92.
93 Shapira: p. 94; Hyamson: *History…*, p. 268.
94 *Hansard*, Volume 39, p. 515. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

> is that, so far from injuring the constitution, it will tend materially to uphold and strengthen it.[95]

As well as the support of the government, the Jews could also count on the young, recently crowned Victoria, whose attitude ran contrary to that of her predecessor, William IV. The Queen honoured Montefiore repeatedly and that same year gave him a knighthood. Just as in times gone by, when the Duchess of Kent (the Queen Mother) and the Duke of Sussex equally lent the Jews their valuable help.

95 Wolf: *Essays*, pp. 315-16. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

Disraeli on the Jewish Race

When Lord Holland and Sir Robert Grant (the latter having been knighted in the interim), both died in 1837,[96] their seats were taken by two men who, alongside Lord John Russell and Rothschild, dedicated their lives to defending the Jewish cause with the same zeal as their predecessors, but with undoubtedly greater skill: Lord Lyndhurst and the baptised Jew Benjamin Disraeli, later Lord Beaconsfield. Neither played a leading role regarding Jewish emancipation, but every year they distinguished themselves ever more considerably with their endeavours in this field. It is even said of Lord Lyndhurst that he hoped to gain the title of 'Emancipator of the Jews',[97] which, as we will see, was undoubtedly fitting.

It is not necessary to go into too much detail about the life of Lord Lyndhurst. Suffice it to say that he was born in 1772, in Boston (America), and that he lived long enough to almost reach his 92nd birthday. He was a jurist and, as such, occupied high and extremely important positions. He was not too scrupulous in his political principles, and often changed his mind on issues.[98]

Disraeli, son of Jewish parents, was born in 1804. On July 31st, 1817, he converted to Christianity, which meant that he had no type of difficulty participating in English public life. He dedicated his young adult life to literature and as a writer he primarily praised the Jewish race. In 1837 he entered Parliament for the first time as a member, to later rise to the highest offices of England. One of his best friends was Lord Lyndhurst,[99] who also enjoyed a close friendship with Rothschild – indeed, we have learned that Rothschild held large galas in his honour.[100] We see then, a triumvirate capable of bringing about the triumph, without a moment's hesitation, of the Jewish cause.

But before returning to general Jewish history it is instructive to describe the truly eye-opening opinion held by Disraeli on the importance of race, as well as his attitude towards Jews in general, according to what can be gleaned from his public speeches,[101] and still more, in his books, now somewhat fallen into obscurity.[102] His attitude is particularly evident in *Coningsby, or The New Generation* (1844), as well as in his political biography *Lord George Bentinck* (1852). The characters who appear in the first work had been taken from public life and only their names had been changed. The main characters are a young Englishman, Coningsby, and his friend and mentor Sidonia, a Jew. The Sidonia character is Rothschild.

Disraeli dedicated the book *Lord George Bentinck* to his friend, the well-known politician. In Chapter 24 of this book, Disraeli deals exclusively with the Jewish Question, and the racial question generally.[103]

In *Coningsby* he reveals that Sidonia had visited the Jewish colonies scattered throughout the world, discovering that the lower-class Jews found themselves mired in the most abject poverty and filth, while those of the upper classes devoted their lives to dirty business deals; but their

96 Wolf: *Essays*, p. 317.
97 Campbell: Volume VIII, p. 199. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
98 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume IV, p. 1107 ff.; Campbell, Volume VIII, p. 1 ff.
99 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume V, p. 1006 ff.
100 Reeves: p. 230.
101 Cf. among other sources, *Hansard*, Volume 95, p. 1321 ff.; Volume 133, p. 872 ff.; Volume 149, p. 752 ff.. T. E. Kebbel: *Selected Speeches of the late Rt. Hon The Earl of Beaconsfield* (2 vols., 1882).
102 Cf. among others, *Vivian Grey* (1826), *Tancred* (1847).
103 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, pp. 482-507.

intellectual development seemed to him to be as strong as ever, which is what gave him hope. The only human quality which interested Sidonia was the intellect, which was why he was not concerned where it may spring from, nor where he found it. Faith, fatherland, character, class – he was indifferent to all of it in this sense.[104]

In *Lord George Bentinck* Disraeli confessed that the Jews were filled with hatred for the whole of humanity, but that in view of the persecutions that they had suffered it could not be surprising that they fought the laws arrayed against them.[105]

The lack of understanding for the Jews had also been the reason that 'the most skilful accumulators of property ally themselves with the communists: this peculiar and chosen race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe'.[106]

In the same work he also reveals that in all of the revolutions that took place around the year 1848, the Jews had always played their part. The revolutions which happened in Germany, Italy and even France had been planned by secret organisations that likewise formed the provisional governments, which were always headed by Jews.[107] The goal of these revolutions was to attack religion and property, and thus it came about that the People of God allied with the atheists. This fateful turn in the Jewish movement does not, in Disraeli's judgement, stem from Jewish nature, but is exclusively a consequence of the ill-treatment meted out to Jews by Christians.[108]

Despite all of the evils, humanity had much to thank the Jews for. According to Disraeli, in the arts they had produced more than the Athenians.[109] Their creative genius had never shone as much as at the time that Disraeli was writing,[110] and when the Russians, French and Anglo-Saxons, fascinated by the charms of a Mozart (!?) or a Mendelssohn, applauded in the theatre, they rendered homage to Jewish art.

Jews led the charge not only in music, but also in science.[111] They were so superior that they should have enjoyed all of the honour and favours that were bestowed on the nordic and occidental races.

In Coningsby, Disraeli believes that he proves that there is no 'great intellectual movement in Europe in which the Jews do not greatly participate. The first Jesuits were Jews. That mysterious Russian Diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe, is organized and principally carried on by Jews.'[112]

With pride, Sidonia declares that he is preparing great international financial transactions.[113]

With the greatest sarcasm Disraeli narrates how Sidonia is called back to London in the middle of an enjoyable sojourn in the countryside, because the ministers of the British Empire cannot meet the interest payments on the national debt. He, the all-powerful international banker, now had to grant new deadlines for the payment. He scornfully asks Coningsby:

---

104 Disraeli: *Coningsby*: p. 91.
105 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, pp. 489-90.
106 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, p. 497. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
107 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, p. 498.
108 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, pp. 489-9.
109 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, p. 493.
110 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, p. 494.
111 *Disraeli: Lord George Bentinck*, p. 491.
112 Disraeli: *Coningsby*, p. 103 onwards. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
113 Disraeli: *Coningsby*, p. 104.

> Can any thing be more absurd than that a nation should apply to an individual to maintain its credit, and with its credit, its existence as an empire and its comfort as a people; and that individual one to whom its laws deny the proudest rights of citizenship, the privilege of sitting in its senate and of holding land...?[114]

The circumstance of Jews trying to extend their influence into every country of the world is likewise interpreted by Disraeli as a special quality of the Jewish character and Jewish capabilities. Of Sidonia, he writes:

> No minister of state had such communication with secret agents and political spies as Sidonia. He held relations with all of the clever outcasts of the world… His extensive travels, his knowledge of languages, his daring and adventurous disposition, and his unlimited means, had given him opportunities of becoming acquainted with these characters, in general so difficult to trace, and of gaining their devotion. To these sources he owed that knowledge of strange and hidden things which often startled those who listened to him. Nor was it easy, scarcely possible, to deceive him. Information reached him from so many, and such contrary quarters, that with his discrimination and experience, he could almost instantly distinguish the truth.[115]

Sidonia details at length the Jews' enormous influence over all the events of Europe, and states at one point in the narrative: 'And every generation they must become more powerful and more dangerous to the society which is hostile to them.'[116] As a consequence, none of Sidonia's interests are limited by national borders.

Very interesting are the reasons he gives to explain why the Jews are capable of exerting such formidable influence in the world, despite all of the persecutions which have persistently targetted them for thousands of years. In his judgement, the only thing that matters, in this sense, is the purity of his race.

> Sidonia was well aware that in the five great varieties in which physiology has divided the human species; to wit, the Caucasian, the Mongolian, the Malayan, the American, the Ethiopian; the Arabian tribes rank in the first and superior class, together, among others, with the Saxon and the Greek. This fact alone is a source of great pride and satisfaction to the animal man. But Sidonia and his brethren could claim a distinction which the Saxon and the Greek, and the rest of the Caucasian nations, have forfeited. The Hebrew is an unmixed race. Doubtless among the tribes who inhabit the bosom of the Desert, progenitors alike of the Mosaic and the Mohammedan Arabs, blood may be found as pure as that of the descendants of the Scheik Abraham. But the Mosaic Arabs are the most ancient, if not the only, unmixed blood that dwells in cities.

---

114 Disraeli: *Coningsby*, p. 102.
115 Disraeli: *Coningsby*, p. 91. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
116 Disraeli: *Coningsby*, p. 103 ff. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

> An unmixed race of a first-rate organisation are the aristocracy of nature. Such excellence is a positive fact; not an imagination…[117]

In this vein, he continues elsewhere in the text:

> The fact is you cannot destroy a pure race of the Caucasian organization. It is a physiological fact; a simple law of nature, which has baffled Egyptian and Assyrian kings, Roman emperors, and Christian inquisitors. No penal laws, no physical tortures, can effect that a superior race should be absorbed in an inferior, or be destroyed by it. The mixed persecuting races disappear; the pure persecuted race remains.[118]

The same declarations can be found elsewhere, but with the addition that it is foolish to talk of the natural equality of mankind and dress it up in the garb of universal brotherhood. Reduced to real terms, it would mean the ruin of all of the great races and the annihilation of all genius in the world:

> What would be the consequence on the great Anglo-Saxon republic, for example, were its citizens to secede from their sound principle of reserve, and mingle with their negro and coloured populations? In the course of time they would become so deteriorated that their states would probably be reconquered and regained by the aborigines whom they have expelled, and who would then be their superiors.[119]

This is the point of view of a leading Jew on the Jewish and racial questions. As has been shown, in his reflections Disraeli has made no distinction between a baptised and an unbaptised Jew, but rather for him, as for us, the principle factor is race. Today, this point of view is considered erroneous and is fought against by the vast majority of the world population, especially in England. It is not surprising to learn then that one of Disraeli's contemporaries roundly attacked him for his attitude.[120]

We have nothing to add to Disraeli's opinions regarding the reprehensible aspects of the Jewish character, or of the influence, in our judgement disastrous, of the Jews on politics, economics, art and science. It is very interesting, nevertheless, to have it confirmed that, for around a hundred years now, destructive Jewish forces have been spreading around the world, working to come to power through criminal revolutions. We see then that nothing has changed.

Perhaps more surprising is Disraeli's opinion on the race problem. Although it is sometimes unclear to us on certain points, it coincides with ours in that is also rejects race-mixing, in order to conserve strength and vigour. We have already seen to what extent we have been attacked by global Jewry precisely for this attitude, despite the fact that one of their most prominent representatives admitted it himself barely a century ago.

---

117 Disraeli: *Coningsby*, p. 91. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
118 Disraeli: *Coningsby*, p. 103. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
119 Disraeli: *Lord George Bentinck*, p. 494. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
120 Padley: *An Answer...*

All of this is enough for now to demonstrate the ideology of that ‘great Englishman’ as he was often called in Great Britain, in what concerns the Jewish Question. Later we will see how he also did everything possible to procure for his ‘superior race’ the place he believed it deserved in the world.

Ritual Murders in the Orient

The year 1840 was to be an important year in many ways.

Shortly before the celebration of Jewish Passover [Pesach], a Capuchin monk disappeared in Damascus. The suspicions of the populace immediately fell on the Jews, as it was suspected that they used human blood to make their *matzo* flatbreads. A Jewish barber was arrested who, apparently after heavy torture, reinforced the suspicion in order to save himself from more mistreatment. He fingered several Jews as the culprits, and of these six were arrested while the remainder escaped. However, they denied all culpability and not even the Turks' torture methods could force them to confess [see footnote below]. Meanwhile, the indignant multitude assaulted and destroyed various Jewish houses.

The French consul in Damascus had for some time represented the interests of all the Catholics in the Middle East and it was under his mandate that the trial was held of the accused Jews, which ended in death sentences being pronounced for all of them, their guilt having been established beyond all reproach. For the sentence to be carried out the consul needed authorisation from the viceroy of Egypt, Mehemet Ali, who had jurisdiction over Damascus.

Almost at the same time, in Rhodes, a ten-year-old boy had died in strange circumstances. In this case too the Jews were immediately suspected. Every single European consul in Rhodes, with the exception of the Austrian representative, went to the pasha in charge requesting that certain Jews, who had been denounced by two Greeks, be punished accordingly. The Jews were arrested and, it appears, treated harshly to force them to confess. [Translator's note: According to available sources, it appears that no body was ever recovered, nor was there conclusive proof that the boy had died, but no reliably objective history of this case has ever been written.]

At the beginning of April 1840, a report of these events arrived in London. Without wasting any time, Sir Moses Montefiore called an assembly of leading Jews. Undoubtedly, they had quickly realised that they needed to take action immediately, not only for the sake of their accused brother Jews, but for the future of Jewish emancipation. If the death sentences were carried out, it would effectively come to be seen as confirmation of the accusation, and the Jewish fight for equal rights would be condemned to failure in the whole world, but most particularly in England, where the events of Asia Minor could be used to great effect by the Jews' adversaries.

It was for this reason that Rothschild, Isaac Lyon Goldsmid and David Salomons gathered, along with others, in the residence of Sir Moses Montefiore, to discuss the measures to be taken. One of France's leading Jews, Crémieux, had been called from Paris, to ensure international cooperation. A memorandum was drawn up in which the accusation was described as a mark of shame on civilisation, and which denied any guilt on the part of the Jews in question.[121]

---

121 Picciotto: pp. 347-50. Wolf: *Essays…* : pp. 320-1. Hyamson: *History…* , pp. 276-7. Translator's note: For the definitive English-language account of the 1840 Damascus case, see Lt. Gen. Mustafa Tlass's *Matzo of Zion / The Matzah of Zion*, (1983, first published in English 1991), published when Tlass was Syria's Minister of Defence. The book reproduces original documents of the case, including interview transcripts of the official investigation, which was led by the French consul, Count Ulysee de Ratti-Menton. While much of the testimony is classifiable as hearsay, what is of interest is the fact that of the three men who initially confessed (two Jewish servants and the Jewish barber), who apparently did so due to promises of immunity rather than torture, all of the details in their confessions regarding the killing, dismemberment and disposal of the monk and his Muslim servant accorded perfectly, despite the immediate separation of the eight suspects who were caught (another six having evaded capture). In addition, Saliman Al-Hallaq (the barber who stated that he was financially induced by one of the

Only someone who has studied and truly come to understand the methods of the Jews in such cases, will be able to suspect what means were made use of to refute the accusations and to save the condemned Jews. As usual, most of the manoeuvring did not become public knowledge, but what was expressed by the Hebrews themselves was enough to reveal that febrile activity had taken place.

Before all else, it was necessary to win over the public. A report, written by the Jews, was sent as a first step to thirty newspapers, who published it immediately.[122] With few exceptions, we see the English press striving, by all means possible, to emphasise the innocence of the Jews and the cruelty of the authorities and the Christians of Asia Minor, who had participated in the accusations; in almost all of the press one could read nothing but praise for the poor 'calumniated Israelites'.[123] An almost unceasing barrage in this vein was directed at the populace. On looking over the *Times* of those days, it is startling to see how often this affair was front and centre of the news agenda, before which the global interests of England seemed to be of secondary importance.[124]

In the face of so much propaganda it cannot be surprising that the City of London was to call a solemn meeting at Mansion House, to show their full sympathy for the Damascus Jews' plight.[125]

A Jewish delegation went to the Foreign Office and begged the Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, to intervene immediately, a request which was promised on the spot. As the published communiqué read:

---

wealthy Jews to slit the monk's throat in the manner of a kosher slaughter, for the bound and gagged man to bleed out into a copper basin over the course of an hour), led the investigators to both the murder location (where investigators found spattered blood on the walls and damaged tiles on the floor where the Padre Tomaso's bones had been smashed) and the sewer opening where the monk's dismembered remains had been discarded, the knowledge of which no torture could induce. Specialists went down into the sewer and recovered pieces of flesh, bone and internal organs (liver and heart). Two committees of doctors, one Muslim, the other French, examined the remains and testified that the bones were human. The Austrian consul testified to seeing some pieces of a black headdress like the one worn by Padre Tomaso, while the priest's barber testified to recognising it as that which had belonged to the priest himself. In addition, Dr. Michael Mashaqah wrote privately of his examination of the remains, which he believed to be of the man whom he had known personally. These included parts of an upper jawbone still retaining a lock of hair from the beard, and the remnant of the thick woollen cloth of the monk's robe, the latter recognised by the doctor as that of Padre Tomaso because it was 'unique in Damascus'. No material evidence appears to have been recovered for the monk's Muslim servant, Ibrahim Amara, although several suspects testified that he was killed and disposed of in a similar manner. One of the accused rabbis later converted to Islam and made a formal statement admitting that both men had been ritually murdered. Given that all Western mainstream sources have worked tirelessly to misrepresent these facts and vilify the incorruptible Count Ratti-Menton, even going as far as to publicly defame his most illustrious supporter, French Prime Minister Adolphe Thiers, it is unsurprising that Aldag's presentation of the case is as above. Ironically, if Ratti-Menton had not intervened to ensure that the case was investigated to the highest standard, it is likely that the guilty parties would have been summarily executed before the European Jews could intervene to free them, and the case would have been quickly forgotten, rather than becoming an international sensation which has echoed down the centuries. Establishment historians also neglect to mention that Ratti-Menton worked to quell the Damascus public's outrage at the murder of the kindly medical holy man who was known to treat Christians, Jews and Muslims alike, and without the Count's intervention it is likely that the Damascus Jewry would have been completely destroyed. [NB: French speakers can also consult Volume II of Achille Laurent's *Relation historique des affaires de Syrie* (1846), which reproduces all documentation in the case as well as providing additional information to the Tlass book, and which was likely written with Ratti-Menton's direct collaboration.]

122 Emanuel: p. 35.

123 Picciotto: pp. 351-2. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

124 See, for example, the *Times* of 2/5/1840, 14/5/1840, 18/5/1840, 28/5/1840, 2/6/1840, 25/6/1840, 29/6/1840, 2/7/1840, 5/7/1840, 6/7/1840, 7/7/1840, 15/7/1840, 6/10/1840, 10/10/1840, 3/12/1840 and 7/12/1840.

125 Picciotto: p. 352. Wolf: *Essays…*, p. 322. Hyamson: *History…*, p. 277.

> Without wasting a moment, he would send instructions to Lord Ponsonby, the English ambassador in Constantinople, and to Colonel Hedges, the English representative in Alexandria, to raise all possible protests, with the goal of preventing the prosecution of such shameful cruelties in the current era.[126]

Shortly afterwards, Lord Palmerston held an audience with a committee from the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, constituted of the Bishop of Ripon, Lord Ashley, Sir George H. Rose MP, and Sir Thomas Baring, who wished to express their profound sympathy for the Jews of Damascus and equally, to request urgently that the British government provide them with protection.

In an open letter, Lord Palmerston gave his assurances that he 'would dedicate his most serious attention to the matter and would ensure that England used her full influence with the government of Constantinople and the pasha of Egypt', to accomplish the triumph of justice and prevent the repetition of such shameful events.[127]

Towards the end of the year, a deputation from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland addressed Lord Palmerston with the same request, and asked also that, from that point on, the British government placed all of the Jews of Asia Minor under its protection.[128]

We have to ask ourselves, quite bewildered, what would induce the London Society to intervene in favour of the Jews, given that, according to its own statutes, it only aimed for the conversion of Jews to Christianity. Seemingly, this public move in favour of unbaptised Jews was not very well received, despite the Society's founding principle being 'to relieve the temporal distress of the Jews, as well as to promote their spiritual welfare'.

The intervention of the English government in favour of the world's Jews will be found even more often later in this study, such as has been the case precisely in recent years, with particularly strong supporting evidence being made known and published.

In accordance with the desire of the last delegation cited, it was officially declared to the Turkish government that England would represent and protect the Jews of Asia Minor from that point onwards, such as France had done with the Catholics. Lord Palmerston charged the consul assigned to Jerusalem with the duty to 'use every effort for the protection of the Eastern Jews'. This aspiration was openly recognised by the Sublime Porte, and, as a consequence, the other British consuls in Turkey received corresponding instructions.[129]

The open co-operation of world Jewry is also observable around this period. Thus we can see that, from almost all parts of the world, including Hamburg, Amsterdam, Barbados, Jamaica,

---

126 *Times*, 2/5/1840. Emanuel: p. 35. Wolf: *Essays…*, p. 321.

127 *Times*, 2/6/1840. Translator's note: The Jews also imposed their will on the French government regarding the Damascus affair. The Jewish historian Léon Poliakov, in his book *Les Samaritains* (Paris: Seuil, 1991, p. 110), admits that James de Rothschild menaced King Louis Philippe of France with the threat that he would short-sell the country's annuity bonds if the king did not dismiss Adolpe Thiers [the then Prime Minister who had supported the Count de Ratti-Menton in his investigation], which forced Thiers to resign: '*Quant à l'affaire de Damas, les Rothchild eurent finalement gain de cause, en menaçant de spéculer sur la baisse de la rente; Thiers dut démissioner.*'

128 *Times*, 3/12/1840.

129 Hyamson: *History…*, pp. 278-9. Wolf: *Essays…*, pp. 322-3. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source [Wolf].

Gibraltar, Altona (Canada), St. Thomas and Philadelphia, large sums of money were sent to aid Montefiore in his Jewish activism.[130]

The Jews came together in the 'Alliance Israélite Universelle', which had its headquarters in Paris. However, as Lucien Wolf reminds us:

> Although its organisation afterwards became centred in Paris, the English Jews have never ceased to hold this primacy in Jewry, thanks to their liberty-loving English instincts, and to the support their work has ever received from the Government and from their Christian fellow-subjects.[131]

It almost goes without saying that international Jewry got their desired victory only with the help of the powerful British government. Sir Moses Montefiore, who directed negotiations in Alexandria and Constantinople, was officially given assurances in both cases that the Jews' innocence had been proven,[132] which is why the imprisoned Jews were set free. For his efforts in the affair, Montefiore received a baronetcy from Queen Victoria and was lauded by members of the royal family.[133]

The events in the Orient had stirred up the compassion of the English. In the face of this wave of sympathy, the Jews hoped to be able move their plans forward, thus it is that by February 9th of the following year the Jews returned with a new bill that would allow a Jew to take up the post of alderman.[134]

To great surprise all round, the bill won a majority at the first and second readings.[135] but at the third, in general not as decisive, it was once again defeated by the Lords.[136]

Yet again a partial Jewish attack had been repelled. Another unsuccessful bid by Salomons in the Maidstone parliamentary elections constituted another failure.[137]

This new defeat for the Jews must certainly have contributed to their decision, from that year onwards, to put all of their energy into creating a well-organised press of their own. In 1841 *The Voice of Jacob* appeared, followed shortly afterwards by *The Jewish Chronicle*.[138]

The people of Damascus had were still upset with the Jews. Colonel Churchill, stationed there by the English, proposed to the London Jewish community the idea of founding a nation-state of their own in Palestine, for which it would be necessary, naturally, for the world's Jews to themselves 'take up the matter *universally* and *unanimously*' and for 'the European Powers to aid them in their establishment'. Of course, the Jews of Palestine would then be Turkish citizens, but under the express protection of the European powers.[139]

---

130 Emanuel: p. 38.
131 Wolf: *Essays…*, p. 322. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
132 Emanuel: pp. 37-40.
133 Wolf: *Essays…*, p. 323.
134 *Hansard*, Volume 56, p. 507.
135 *Hansard*, Volume 58, p, 1048.
136 *Hansard*, Volume 58, p. 1458.
137 Shapira: p. 94.
138 Picciotto: p. 402 ff.; Hyamson: *History…*, p. 276.
139 Emanuel: pp. 42-3. Translator's note: Quoted segments reproduced verbatim from original source.

In view of how events later unfolded, it turns out to be quite ironic that the Jews who lived in England had been presented with Zionist plans for the first time by a Briton of the same name as their current champion, Winston Churchill.

When in 1843 the Jews of Tétouan and Tunisia reported mistreatment, the British consul, by order of his government, protested to the bey, who then promised his support.[140]

In the second half of 1841 and in the following two years there is no record of any particular action by the Jews to get closer to their final goals. Perhaps this is due to a certain level of fatigue and a lack of internal cohesion. Indeed, this latter thesis is supported by the fact that, within the Jewish community the religious Reform movement had begun, a schism which seemed to absorb most of the Jews' strength as it divided them into two mutually antagonistic factions.[141]

140 Emanuel: p. 47.
141 Emanuel: pp. 41-50. Wolf: *Essays…*, pp. 323-6.

David Salomons: City of London Alderman

David Salomons was again elected Alderman of the City of London in 1844. He was confident that this time he would be able to convince the Court of Aldermen to let him take possession of this post without the required oath, because the authorities of other cities had already dispensed with it.

When he appeared in front of the council, they demanded, however, that he take the oath, which he refused with lengthy historical and legal explanations, his speech ending with the words: 'I appeal to you for justice; I look for a just merciful and liberal interpretation of the law.'[142]

The denial of his aspiration was the justice his arrogance deserved.[143]

Lord Lyndhurst based his bill on the fact that many Jews had already satisfactorily taken up high positions and even some cities – like Portsmouth, Southampton and Birmingham – had admitted them as aldermen without such an oath.[144] In addition, the Bishop of London let it be known that he would vote in favour of the bill because not to do so 'would only raise discussion, and excite angry feelings, and lessen the grace of the boon that they were about to confer on this respectable body of men'. Nevertheless, he remained against the Jews being admitted to Parliament, and he would vote against any law in this regard.[145] According to findings, not a single member spoke against the bill, nor did a vote take place that was worthy of mention – a good condition for it to be admitted. The motion was presented to Parliament by Sir Robert Peel personally, who also explained in great detail why he supported it.[146] Unmoved, Sir Robert Inglis[147] once again resumed his arguments on why the bill should be defeated and complained bitterly of how the Jewish aldermen of Birmingham had been able to attack the regulations with such impunity, which was why the Jewish nation was now going to be rewarded with such a favourable law.[148] With the overwhelming majority of 91 votes to 10, the bill was passed into law, and on July 31st, 1845, it received the Royal Assent.[149]

A truly magnificent success! The tactic of attrition, by means of fatigue and demoralisation, had shown its effectiveness yet again, and Judah now had every position in the town hall lying open before it.[150] The danger that the passing of this law represented for the Jews' adversaries was recognised in certain places. With bitter words the *Morning Post* complained of the law being passed in the House of Lords and described it in an editorial of July 19th, 1845 as a 'blow to the old British constitution'. It was a move that seemed inconceivable to the author, who was stunned that a Conservative government had put the British constitution on the line for a handful of Jews.

Soon afterwards the Hebrews won a second victory, one that paved the way for the final battle: admission into Parliament.

---

142 Salomons: *Case…*, pp. 4-34. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source (p. 34).
143 Salomons: *Case…*, pp. 3, 4. Henriques: *Jews*, p. 255.
144 *Hansard*, Volume 78, p. 515 ff.
145 *Hansard*, Volume 78, p. 524. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
146 *Hansard*, Volume 82, pp. 622-7.
147 *Hansard*, Volume 82, pp. 627-32.
148 *Hansard*, Volume 82, p. 633.
149 *Hansard*, Volume 82, p. 1271.
150 *Statutes of the United Kingdom*, Volume 85, pp. 480-1.

The following year, not only were the last doubts finally quashed on the issue of possession of immovable property, which up until that point had still not been completely clarified, but the annulment process was also begun for the so-called Statute of Jewry and the laws passed under Henry III, according to which, among other directives, the Jews were to wear special signifiers which distinguished them from other citizens.

Lord John Russell once again distinguished himself, as always, very brilliantly, and the bill passed easily through all the relevant stages in the Upper Chamber, where it had first been presented.[151] Parliament also approved the bill in the fastest possible time,[152] whereupon it became the Religious Disabilities Act of 1846, and passed into the Parliamentary Archives under its official title: 'An Act to relieve Her Majesty's Subjects from certain Penalties and Disabilities in regard to Religious Opinions.'[153]

In this way practically all of the biggest Jewish disabilities had been eliminated, and now only admission to the House of Commons and the House of Lords remained forbidden to them.

The Jews and their allies then began invading the newly conquered terrain, and thus the number of Jews who occupied town hall positions began to grow steadily. David Salomons, who did not waste time in getting elected yet again as a City of London alderman, could finally take possession of his post.

Other Jewish advances followed: Anthony de Rothschild (one of the brothers) and Isaac Lyon Goldsmid were elevated to the baronetcy, but it was the events of 1847 which revealed the powerful position of the Jews in society, in the most obvious way.

151 *Hansard*, Volume 85, p. 1254 ff.; Volume 88, p. 360 ff.

152 *Hansard*, Volume 88, p. 630 ff., 677.

153 *Statutes of the United Kingdom*, Volume 86, p. 413. Translator's note: Wording reproduced verbatim from original source. Proof that the 1275 Statute of Jewry of Edward I was still effectively in force up until this time is the fact that the aforementioned statute is found in the 1810 edition of the royally sanctioned *Statutes of the Realm* (Vol. I, pp. 220-221), but is absent from the 1870 edition (*The Statutes: Revised Edition*, Vol I.).

Salomons Loses, Rothschild Wins

During this time, a general election for Parliament was announced. To general surprise, David Salomons was presented as a candidate for Greenwich (a district of London), and Lionel Rothschild, the head of the banking house, was presented for the City of London seat. Salomons only let his intentions in this sense be known on the day before the elections.[154]

The tactic of the Jews and their allies was obvious. They hoped, as with the municipal elections, to put before Parliament a *fait accompli*, by working things so that some leading Jews were elected so that afterwards, by appealing to popular opinion, they could once again move the struggle from the terrain of the principle to the terrain of the particular. This method had shown itself to be effective for the municipal elections, so likewise on this occasion, they counted on achieving the same result.

The 29th of July was Nomination Day, the day on which the candidates for each electoral district were to be solemnly announced. In addition, the election could take place by open acclaim, providing that there were no express protest against this. As this proceeding is always used more or less as proof, it comes to be practically the same thing as the pre-election poll.

In Greenwich, the candidates who presented themselves, besides Salomons, were Admiral James Dundas, Mr. E. G. Barnard, and Mr. Samuel Kidd. On Nomination Day, as per usual, some 5,000 to 6,000 people had turned up to listen to the different candidates' point of view in terms of their electoral programme.

The pre-election poll gave Salomons the majority. Dundas and Barnard then requested the definitive election to be held the next day,[155] which brought them full victory and Salomons defeat in the battle for a seat in Parliament.[156]

Rothschild was luckier. For the most varied reasons, he clinched a decisive victory in the most important constituency of England, despite the Conservatives trying to get the electors to understand in their electoral meetings, that under no circumstance should Rothschild be elected.[157]

The Jewish-friendly press did not only look at the election result with pleasure, but considered as totally unjust the situation which had prevailed up until that point. Given the English constitution, there was no way to prevent the Hebrews exercising an indirect influence on legislation. 'By entering into Parliament,' this press stated, 'they do not acquire a new influence, so much as a just and wise recognition of that which they already possess.'[158]

There is no doubt that a myriad of factors must have contributed to ensuring Rothschild's electoral success. One of those was most certainly the organised bribery of the electors. Of course, it is difficult to prove such crimes, given that all of the participants are obligated to remain silent; but in this case we can make such a grave statement, being able to base our allegation on an objective historical investigation.

Already by July 19th, a feared agent and his two assistants had left the city of Norwich for London. The honourable citizens of Norwich warned their London friends of the agent's upcoming

154 *Daily News*, 30/7/1847.
155 *Standard*, 31/7/1847.
156 *Standard*, 31/7/1847.
157 *Morning Herald*, 27/7/1847; *Morning Post*, 27/7/1847; *Standard*, 26/7/1847.
158 *Morning Chronicle*, 27/7/1847. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

visit, because through their investigations they had discovered that this agent had already just spent £20,000 in bribes for the election of a Liberal [i.e. Whig] candidate, and it would appear that he was now making his way to the capital on a similar mission.

These facts were published in an open letter from a top Conservative in the *Morning Herald* of July 31st, 1847, and we will see further on if the actions of this agent and his accomplices would not have raised a red flag.

With great participation, Nomination Day arrived, in which the different candidates for the Liberals and the Conservatives set out their political agendas. But for now our primary concern is the circumstances around this event and in particular the electors present, who for the most part had come from the poorest and dirtiest districts of London's East End. At least three quarters of these people were made up of Jews, 'and those of the very worst type and most repulsive aspect', who did not stop shouting down the speakers they did not like. When Rothschild began to speak one could observe the greatest silence, and only occasionally was his speech interrupted with shouts of approval, while, by contrast, the other Liberal candidates [the City of London was a four-member seat] had trouble making themselves heard through 'the howling of the rabble', several of whom had 'wrought themselves into… a state of demoniacal phrenzy'. In short, according to the *Daily News*, the whole hustings area had been 'usurped, to the exclusion of electors, by an unwashed mass of *claqueurs*, comprising coal porters, dustmen, venders of old clothes, and others *id genus omne…*'.

The provisional election results showed the Liberal candidates – and therefore also Rothschild – had won at least nine tenths of the votes, which shouldn't be a surprise given the composition of the electors who had turned up. The Conservatives then asked for an election proper.[159]

Election day came and it appears that there were truly frenzied scenes. The longshoremen – individuals who had been given the job of bribery – were working all day, especially in the poorest boroughs of the city: Cripplegate, Bishopsgate, Smithfield, etc. These individuals, strangers to the local people, obstructed the route to the polling place, tried to turn people away, or else tried to persuade them by every means possible, and at times were seen slipping electors amounts of money ranging from three to five pounds, naturally in exchange for a Liberal vote, that is to say, for Rothschild. Some voters, who did not hide this trade, reported these offers to the Conservatives and even showed themselves open to selling them their vote for an equal (or perhaps somewhat higher) price. As the Conservatives rejected such activities, the corresponding votes fell to the Liberals.

These events could be observed again and again. In each polling place, the same tableau. The last hour of the election must have been a very serious affair. Not only was the bribery taking place more brazenly than at the start, but even the prices of the votes went up, and up to £68 came to be paid per vote, with the result that the electors who arrived late ended up well paid.

With such methods it could easily be guessed from the start who would win the elections. Lord John Russell won the majority of the votes by 7,137; then followed two more Liberal candidates – one of them Rothschild – and only one Conservative managed to get elected.[160]

---

159 *Daily News*, 29/7/1847; *Morning Post*, 29/7/1847. Translator's note: Unless stated otherwise, all quoted elements are reproduced verbatim from the *Morning Post*.

160 *Morning Post*, 30/7/1847, 31/7/1847, 27/5/1848, 29/7/1851; *Morning Herald*, 30/7/1847, 31/7/1847; *Standard*, 26/11/1847, 21/12/1847.

It must be stressed that the facts conveyed here were published in the newspapers, which is why without doubt they were also public knowledge. What is more, these practices were openly repeated in the years that followed.

In bombastic rhetoric the Judaising press fêted Rothschild's victory. They assured readers that, with this election, the City of London had covered itself in imperishable glory and that the Jewish Question was now practically resolved,[161] that Jewry's triumph was of the greatest importance, not only for England, but also for the entire world. As the *Morning Chronicle* wrote:

> Here we have seen a Prime Minister of the British empire [Lord John Russell] take a Jew by the hand, and go before the first of British constituencies, and say – 'Help me to emancipate this man [Lionel de Rothschild] from the last wretched remnant of a stupid and insulting tyranny, and make him one of ourselves, in all the franchises of an equal and common citizenship.'[162]

There was just one thing that all of these newspapers forgot in the euphoria of their triumph: to refute the accusation from the opposing side regarding the criminal methods used in the elections. Or was it that they were not capable of doing it? Whatever the reason may have been, we still search in vain for rebuttals of the accusation.[163]

The press of the Jews' adversaries were left horrified by the election result: What a disgrace that a Jew was elected to represent the City of London! The election outcome meant that gold had triumphed. Unimaginable amounts of money – £25,000 was talked of – had been disbursed in bribes. Truly, this was a brilliant triumph for the principle of freedom of religion – a verbatim quotation from a post-election speech given by Lord John Russell. At least in Greenwich they had had the integrity to reject the election of a Jew.

Great concerns were also harboured about the future. Nothing good could be expected from the annulment of religion and principles, for 'it was as plain as day that Rothschild owed his election to money, money, and nothing but money'.[164]

Let us briefly analyse whether or not the reproaches made by the Jews' adversaries regarding bribery were justified, reproaches which we believe can be supported for various reasons.

As all of the accusations were made publicly, in the newspapers, it would have been very easy to refute them if they were not based on facts. But none of that happened. Was this silence due to an unclean conscience, or was it a fear of further riling up the enemy press, which might induce them to make new revelations?

Why was there no defamation claim raised against the owners and editors of the corresponding newspapers, or against the leading Conservatives of the City of London?

Not just the press, but also a few members in the House of Commons, Mr. Bankes, and most of all Mr. Newdegate[165] – whom we shall return to later – formally repeated these allegations. The

---

161 *Sunday Times*, 1/8/1847.
162 *Morning Chronicle*, 30/7/1847. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
163 *Morning Chronicle*, 31/7/1847, 3/8/1847; *Times*, 30/7/1847, 31/7/1847, 2/8/1847, 3/8/1847; *Sunday Times*, 1/8/1847; *Evening Sun*, 30/7/1847, 31/7/1847, 2/8/1847, 3/8/1847.
164 *Morning Post*, 30/7/1847, 31/7/1847; *Morning Herald*, 30/7/1847, 31/7/1847.
165 *Hansard*, Volume 116, p. 372.

former expressed himself in the following way: ‘As to the recent and previous elections for the City of London, if report spoke true, money had great influence in turning the scales; and if, in the City of London, money could produce such results, what might not be apprehended in other parts of the country?’[166]

It is interesting to note, according to what can be gathered from Hansard, that there was no uproar or protest from the pro-Jewish MPs. All of them stayed silent, and given that not even the Jews’ adversaries showed any sign of surprise at these accusations, we can conclude that the accusations must have been facts that were already very well known.

It is also instructive to verify if, given the general conditions of the elections that were held in those days, it would really have been possible to bribe in the way that had been alleged.

In 1830 it was an open secret that ‘more than a third of the seats in Parliament are notoriously purchasable’.[167] Some honourable members ceaselessly called attention to such an intolerable situation, which would naturally lead to the nation’s demoralisation. In 1844 there were further protests against abuses of this type.[168] Shortly before Rothschild’s election, on July 12th, 1847, there was an in-depth debate in the House of Lords over the fact that most MPs, even those in the highest offices of government, were not free of such methods, and that recently in one constituency, the voters had affixed to their hats, in the style of cockades, the banknotes that they had received for their votes.[169]

But nor was there any improvement in this matter over the subsequent years. To all appearances, there was little inclination to intervene and the members of the public who cared about ending such a shameful situation complained in vain of Parliament’s intentional neglect.[170] In articles of the *Morning Post* of the 2nd and 16th of March, 1853, we see the proportions these bribes could take:

> Mr. Walpole brought up the report of this committee [the Huddersfield Election Committee], which was as follows: ‘…That Mr. Stansfield was, by his agents, guilty of bribery and treating at the last election for the borough of Huddersfield. That it was proved to the committee that William Radford, a publican; David Dodson, a publican; and Jacob Senior, a publican, were each of them bribed by colourable payments… That Joseph Halliwell was bribed by obtaining for his nephew, as a condition for his vote, three 25-gallon casks of ale, a portion of which his nephew gave away among the electors on the day of the election, and the remainder of which he sold at a profit. That the treating throughout the borough during the last election was general, systematic, and extravagant in its character. That between 60 and 70 public houses at the last election were opened by the agents of the sitting member. That refreshments were provided, apparently, without limit, and paid for without inquiry.
>
> There is… a brigade of voters, as well known in the locality as any other brigade to the general public, who regard the franchise simply as a saleable commodity, and who deal with it precisely as a broker does with a gold-mining or Australian land share. They are,

166 *Hansard*, Volume 95, p. 1306. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
167 *Times*, 3/5/1830. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
168 *Hansard*, Volume 26, p 516 ff., p. 874; *Times*, 5/6/1844.
169 *Hansard*, Volume 94, p. 169 ff.
170 *Times*, 9/3/1853, 10/3/1853; *Morning Post*, 2/3/1853, 8/3/1853, 14/3/1853; *Standard*, 22/2/1853.

> for the most part, gross, drunken, deboshed, idle vagabonds, who have no recollection of the past, and no thought of the future… Their thoughts and calculations extend not beyond the present, and their soul is in a beer-pot.
>
> [Translator's note: The first paragraph is quoted verbatim from the 16th March issue, the second paragraph from the 2nd March issue]

These unpleasant events did not change in the slightest until the emancipation battle ended in 1858.[171]

As such, the Rothschild case did not constitute any kind of exception. Nevertheless, the widespread use of such methods and Parliament's lack of interest in the matter, explains perfectly why Rothschild could indulge in such behaviour.

Rothschild himself confirmed the suspicion of bribery at a later date, through his own statements, as he let it be understood that his election in the City of London had cost him between £20,000 and £25,000.[172] The true costs for an election of that kind in those days was normally between £800 and £1,000, with perhaps a City of London seat reaching a maximum of £5,000.[173]

Until then, Rothschild had no chance of occupying a place on the bench in the House of Commons, due to not being able to swear the required Oath of Abjuration.

The Jews and their allies began to make every preparation to eliminate, at last, the final obstacle in their way, and a new heated battle over the issue soon began in Parliament.

---

171 *Times*, 16/8/1854, 3/4/1857, 4/7/1857; *Morning Post*, 20/5/1854, 30/5/1854, 22/7/1854, 25/7/1857; *Daily News*, 22/3/1858, 20/4/1858.

172 *Morning Herald*, 30/7/1847.

173 *Morning Herald*, 30/7/1847. *Hansard*: Volume 94, p. 169 ff.

A New Propaganda Campaign

A new wave of propaganda washed over the country in the form of countless pamphlets. It is instructive to take a quick look at some of them.

A new booklet by Francis Henry Goldsmid complained that the Jews who had been admitted to the highest position in the state's bureaucracy still continued to be banned from Parliament, a measure incompatible with the Christian religion, given 'the foundation of the New [Testament], "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"'.[174]

Another writer demanded reparation for the injustice committed against the Jews up until that point, and said that the British nation, 'as a younger and beloved sister', should contribute promptly to 'the glory and happiness of restored Israel'.[175]

Barnard van Oven, who had already distinguished himself in similar matters years before, naturally could not but get involved on this occasion. He analysed the religious reasoning of the adversaries, which he considered erroneous on all points, because 'England has ceased to be a Christian country'.[176]

In *Chambers Miscellany of Useful Tracts*, a 'History of the Jews in England' was published which from the start earned a large circle of readers. Nobody would have thought that the author could be the Jewess Grace Aguilar,[177] because it is certain that then a large part of the readership would have considered elements of the work to be extremely arrogant, and would therefore have rejected it.

The first part of the book condemns the cruelties committed in earlier times against the poor Jews and then praises at length the wisdom of Menasseh ben Israel.

It was a lamentable situation that parts of society still continued to look down on Jews, who were 'Jews only in their religion – Englishmen in everything else'. And on the subject of Jewish disabilities, the question is asked: 'Is it not discreditable to the common sense of the age that such anomalies should exist in reference to this well-disposed and, in every respect, naturalised portion of the community?'

She stated that the Jews originating from Spain were comparable to princes, while those coming from Germany still left a lot to be desired. But the fault did not lie with the Jews themselves, but with the persecutions that they had suffered in said country. If it were not for this, one would not find Jewish criminals and beggars.

After having made some descriptions of the supposed persecutions suffered by the Jews on the Continent, that then as today aroused the compassion of the English, there followed, until the end of the book, a heartfelt appeal which called for peace with the Jews and to give them everything they wanted and belonged to them by right.[178]

---

174 Goldsmid: *Reply...*, pp. 5-7, 56-57. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. Readers will undoubtedly be familiar with Jews teaching Christians the tenets of Christianity.
175 Birks: pp. 7-8, 59. Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.
176 van Oven: *Ought Baron de Rothschild...*, pp. 20, 25. Translator's note: Quoted verbatim from original source.
177 Levy, pp. 11-12.
178 Aguilar: pp. 1-13, 16-18, 22-32. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.

In addition, the Jewish-friendly press was very active and, as usual, must also have been working hard in the shadows. By every means possible and from the beginning, the Jews strove to know intimately the attitudes of the members of both Houses regarding the Jewish Question.[179]

At the start of December 1847 it was believed that preparations were now sufficiently advanced to be able to push the issue of the Jewish Question into Parliament once again, especially in view of the fact that the Jews enjoyed the full support of the Whig government. As always, the Prime Minister Lord John Russell was a prominent player in the battle, on this occasion personally tabling a motion 'that the House will resolve itself into a Committee on the removal of the civil and political Disabilities affecting Her Majesty's Jewish subjects', with the goal of thus granting, in one fell swoop, full equality of rights for the Jews.

Lord John Russell[180] expressed himself in an excellent dialectic way regarding his bill. To judge from the extant textual evidence, the speech must have lasted for hours. From the looks of things he dealt at length with the history of the Jews. He stressed in particular that these were people of the highest morals, unbeaten in the fulfilment of their duties to the state and their loyalty to the Crown, which was why it was a source of shame to continue depriving persons of such qualities of their rights. The Jews born in England were English and nothing else.

He was followed by the leader of the Jews' adversaries, Sir Robert Inglis,[181] who also spoke at great length and in great detail. He expressed his surprise that the Prime Minister would personally lend such support to the bill and stated that he did not share his opinions in the slightest. He said that the Jews lauded the Prime Minister's support 'with especial joy', which they saw 'as a signal augury of their approaching triumph'.

> …this, I think, is the first country in which, without a revolution, the change [to the Constitution] has ever been proposed. And for whom is it now proposed in England? For some thirty or forty thousand strangers! For some, whose very names and titles prove them to be un-English. For those, who, as I believe, never can be English… but in the first instance I may assert, without fear of contradiction, that two centuries ago there was not one single Jew in this realm of England; that they came in, drop by drop… Did we invite them? Did they come in for our convenience? Did they not come in for their own?… Do they not enjoy every social protection? Do they not live in all luxury? Does anyone envy them the wealth which they gain among us? But, on the other hand, can they claim from us the sacrifice of the Christian character of our Constitution, for the sake of admitting them to a share of governing us? Can they ever, as true Jews, be amalgamated with us? Are they not always, necessarily and intrinsically, a separate people?…

Benjamin Disraeli also took part in the debate. He said that the hypothesis of Judaism being able to modify a country's Christian character was ridiculous. In every place one could see, according to him, the prevailing influence of the Jews, who were superior to all other races in the world. He claimed that the Christian doctrine itself was an eloquent testament to that, as its authors

179 Myers: pp. 240-6.
180 *Hansard*, Volume 95, pp. 1234-1249. Translator's note: Quoted verbatim from original source.
181 *Hansard*, Volume 95, pp. 1249-1265. Translator's note: Speech excerpts quoted verbatim from original source.

were Jews. It was absurd, therefore, to reject Jewish emancipation for religious reasons. Every holiday announced the doctrine of Jewish heroes and poets to the people, which was proof of why the Jews were considered of higher morals. Below are some typically representative excerpts from his speech:

> …for every Gentleman here does profess the Jewish religion, and believes in Moses and the prophets. (Interjection: 'Oh!')
>
> …Where is your Christianity, if you do not believe in their Judaism?
>
> …And I cannot but believe that a man owning all the traditions, all the habits, all the laws of a Jew – a man who wishes to remain inviolate the religious institutions in every country in which he lives – must ever look upon the Catholic Church, whatever may be its form, with no other feelings than those of the deepest interest, and, as I think, with those of reverent affection.
>
> …Yes, it is as a Christian that I will not take upon me the awful responsibility of excluding from the Legislature those who are of the religion in the bosom of which my Lord and Saviour was born.

His speech ended by calling for eternal gratitude to the Jews and their works, and pleading that only for this reason – and not for the fact that as citizens and taxpayers they had the right to a seat in Parliament – Lord John Russell's bill had to be passed.[182] What pride, what arrogance in front of Parliament, are to be found in these words!

The honourable member Mr. Wood[183] considered it an injustice that use was made of the Jews' great influence and wealth without the Jews themselves being granted rights. Meanwhile, the honourable member Mr. Henry Ker Seymer warned of allowing a single Jew entry into Parliament. Working in different ways, with the help of their money, they would not waste time in gaining new parliamentary seats.[184]

After long debates, the bill was passed by Parliament.[185]

Just as on previous occasions, the House of Commons had therefore taken Jewish wishes into account. Nevertheless, despite all of the propaganda and the support from high places, they could not, in any way, silence the opposition, as is shown by the speeches delivered in Parliament and the articles printed in the press of the Jews' adversaries.

The *Morning Post* did not consider it an injustice that the Jews were denied, once and for all, the right to enter Parliament. The pro-rights reasoning that Jews were English and as such had the right to sit in Parliament was false, because 'the Jew is not an Englishman' and Jews as a group would always continue being 'natural and undoubted enemies' who must not be allowed 'the power of perverting the institutions of a Christian state'.[186]

---

182 *Hansard*: Volume 95: p. 1321 ff. Translator's note: All quotations reproduced verbatim from original source. I have also included elements of the speech where were elided in Aldag's text, for their interest to the modern reader.

183 *Hansard*: Volume 96: pp. 228-242.

184 *Hansard*: Volume 96: pp. 481 ff.

185 *Hansard*: Volume 96: p. 536 ff., Volume 98, p. 667 ff.

186 *Morning Post*, 15/12/1847, 18/12/1847. Translator's note: The first quotation comes from the 18/12/1847 issue, the second quotation the 15/12/1847 issue. The later issue also questions the propriety of allowing the Jews a share in

The *Standard* also adhered to these arguments over the course of numerous articles, and added that 'never was the usurer *caste* more odious, or more justly odious, to the country than at the present moment; and it is to facilitate the admission to *power* of the usurer *caste* that the doors of Parliament are to be thrown open to the deniers of the blessed Redeemer of mankind'. Regarding the supposed 'intolerance against the Jews', it was already quite enough just having to tolerate their presence.[187]

The editorial in the *Standard* of December 18th, 1847, on the topic of the 'odious and sinful' Jew Bill, contains some particularly harsh attacks on the Jews themselves. The following are excerpts of the article [reproduced verbatim from the original source]:

> We therefore must protest against the line of argument taken by Lord John Russell and his supporters, and tell them that the *onus* of proof of necessity for abolishing the Christian character of the British constitution rests upon them, not upon us, who would maintain those principles and institutions that have existed amongst us for far more than one thousand years – indeed, ever since Britain emerged from barbarism. Nothing has occurred to change the character of the Jews or their relations to us during that long period. If, therefore, we are fools and oppressors because we exclude Jews from the government of the country, our ancestors have been fools and oppressors for more than ten centuries...
>
> […]
>
> Now Jews are not *Englishmen*, though born in this country; they are and claim to be *an exclusive nation* – a nation separated from all others… But, admitting, contrary to the truth, that Jews born in this country are Englishmen, Lord John Russell's proposition does not apply, for there are millions of 'Englishmen born in this country' who are excluded from sitting in Parliament by want of a property qualification, or of ability to support the expenses of a parliamentary election. We might add the millions of 'Englishmen born in this country' who have not even a vote for representatives because they do not hold a 40-shilling freehold or a 10-pound house. We pass over officers in the public service, and the whole body of the clergy, because they embrace their disqualification; but we demand to know, why the want of a given sum of money is more inconsistent with the possession of civil privileges than the want of faith in the Saviour of mankind, whom all 'Englishmen born in this country' reverently acknowledge.
>
> The number of Jews in this country (rated by Lord John Russell at 40,000, by Lord George Bentinck at 25,000) can bear only upon the question of policy, for right is not to be determined by numbers. If the Jews have *a right* to be among our governors, no matter whether their number be ten, or ten millions, they ought to be admitted to the enjoyment of that right; but if we are free to grant or to refuse, according to the determination of policy, the number of Jews is a consideration of some weight. We should like to see a statistical analysis of our 25,000 or 40,000 Jews, as the case may be. How many of them are usurers? How many of them of the trade of *Mr. Fagan*?

---

the control of the nation's political destiny.

187 *Standard*, 26/11/1847, 29/11/1847, 18/12/1847, 20/12/1847, 21/12/1847, 24/12/1847. Translator's note: The quotation in the text is reproduced verbatim from the 26/11/1847 issue.

> How many of them sheriffs' officers, members of the ring, keepers of flash-houses, or engaged in still more loathsome occupations? How many, if any, occupied in useful industry? How many ever held a plough, or are connected with the soil of the country?
>
> […]
>
> But their numbers, says Lord John, are not formidable as 'a physical power'. No, but they may be formidable as a vehicle of pestilence – a bale of plague-poisoned cloth may destroy more than the most numerous army, and the introduction of unbelievers into the legislature alone is enough to poison, by the contempt of religion which it evinces, the religion and morality of the nation; *and it will destroy both*, if it ever be consummated.

In an article of February, 14th, 1848, the *Morning Post* said the following apropos of the general character of the Jews [reproduced verbatim from the original source]:

> As we have plunged into the unamiable, we will venture to add, that throughout the debate the general character of the Jews seems to have been dealt with but too tenderly. That there are good and generous men among them we should be sorry to deny; but when considering the question whether or no the barrier between them and the Legislature should be removed, it is fair to take their general character into account. Now, whatever may have been suppressed by the somewhat squeamish courtesy of Parliament in these days of weak civility, we know very well that the general impression, and we believe the just impression, of the people of this country is that the Jews are more discreditable members of society than any other sect or class of the same numerical amount. Whatever is most gross and revolting in the immoralities and secret abominations of crowded communities –
>
> > '...whatever vice /
> >
> > The cruel city breeds'
>
> – is chiefly under the management of persons of the Jewish race. We do not accuse their religion, for we believe these persons have no religion. The Jews of the lower orders, says Mr. Coleridge in his 'Table Talk', are the very lowest of mankind; they have not a principle of honesty in them; to grasp and to be getting money for ever is their single and exclusive occupation. A learned Jew once said to him upon this subject, 'Oh! Sir, make the inhabitants of Holywell Street and Duke's Place Israelites first, and then we may debate about making them Christians.'
>
> The vileness of these people in our great cities being notorious, we should think the best preparation which their great men could make for satisfying the British public that they were worthy to approach Parliament would be in strenuous efforts to reform the character and conduct of wretches who are a disgrace not merely to the Hebrew race, but to human nature itself.

In an article of February 7th, 1848, the *Times* takes an interest in the Opposition's argument, according to which the admission of Jews would strip the legal institutions of their Christian character, and ends, after long consideration, with a rejection of the idea. What is strange is that the *Times* never decided to avail itself of the other arguments used by the Jews' adversaries, such as bribery, vice and the enmity of the Jews towards the state.

Judging from the tone of the press, the opinions around this issue were much more heated than in previous times. More and more the knowledge of this being more than a religious issue was breaking through into the press. The question that the Jews' adversaries were worriedly asking themselves was what the House of Lords would do this time, and whether it would have the courage to resist, yet again, all of the pressure being brought to bear.

On the 25th of May, 1848, the bill came before the House of Lords.

Lord Brougham made an address specifically to counter the allegation, made several times in the press, that the bill had originated in a trading house in the City of London. It was out of the question, he said, that there had been any collaboration between Lord John Russell and Baron Rothschild.[188]

The heated debate ended with a vote in favour of the Jews' adversaries, with which the latest Israelite attack was roundly repulsed.

Neither did the mass of the English people show itself open to supporting the Jews' desires in any way, as is shown by the petitions which were sent to Parliament in support or opposition of the bill. A quick examination of these petitions makes clear that the vast majority were against the laws in question,[189] just as every aspect of public life signalled an anti-Jewish attitude among the people. It is true that we found out about two assemblies, held in Edinburgh and Cambridge, in favour of the Jews, but against them we also noted that there was a corresponding anti-Jewish opposition.[190]

For those who were certain of triumph, the events of 1848 must have been a bitter disappointment. But from the new wave of propaganda being pushed by the Jews, it can be deduced that the decision had been made to keep up the fight. A book was published of the most important speeches made regarding the latest Jewish bill. The author Charles Egan, a barrister, summarised the different counter-arguments made by the opposition as if it were a legal document, and tried to refute them.[191]

Later followed, among others, Henry Hughes,[192] the perpetual curate who stood up most vehemently to counter the assertion that the Jew was an outsider in England, and the Reverend Henry Street,[193] who called the Jews his benefactors and tried to reward them with the desired law.

A year later a new attack was initiated in Parliament, under the direction of Lord John Russell. This time he titled his bill 'Parliamentary Oaths Bill', to avoid any first impression of this being a measure to favour the Jews. In principle, it called for a general reform of the oath taken by members of Parliament; the proposed new text would thus mean that there was no longer any

188 *Hansard*: Volume 98, 1398.
189 *Morning Post*, 17/12/1847; *Standard*, 17/12/1847; *Times*, 17/12/1847; *Standard*, 22/12/1847.
190 *Standard*, 30/12/1847; *Times*, 13/1/1848, 2/2/1848.
191 Egan: p. 150 ff.
192 Hughes: pp. 6-7.
193 Street: pp. 30-1.

further obstacle for the Jews. But it was not long before the adversaries noticed the secret intention of Lord Russell.

After a skilful speech from the Prime Minister, Sir John Robert Inglis took the floor. He started with the objection that the law would only serve to facilitate the entry of Jews into Parliament, and then went on to say: '…whenever they were admitted into that House, they would form a nucleus for their own opinions, and there were many instances of a small compact body having a great effect upon the public deliberations.'[194]

The honourable member Major Beresford [1st Viscount Beresford] agreed with Sir Robert Inglis.[195] In his judgement, the main reason for the demand to modify the oath was the fact that the City of London had elected a Jew.

Both were supported by Charles Newdegate, who later came to be regularly prominent in the debates. As Hansard reports:

> Mr. Newdegate said, that no one could accuse the hon. Member for Tavistock of religious bigotry, since he would admit not only Jews, but Hindoos and Mahometans to Parliament. The hon. Member might be a bigot to his opinions on political economy, but not on religion certainly: he seemed to agree with Voltaire, who urged, that because Jews and Christians made money together on the Exchange, therefore that there ought to be no restriction upon the admission of Jews into the Legislature. But was there no difference between the House of Commons and the Exchange? If the House of Commons and the Exchange were the same, there certainly would be no justice in the exclusion of Jews from Parliament; but he had been brought up in a different school of belief. He had been taught to consider the House of Commons as the representatives of a great Christian country, assisting a Christian Sovereign in the discharge of her Christian duties; and he could not therefore look to this as the denial of a right of the Jews to sit in a Christian Parliament. The right to a seat in the Legislature was spoken of as a privilege; but he (Mr. Newdegate) considered a seat in that House not as a right or a privilege, but simply as a trust vested in the person elected by the public for the public good […] if they admitted the Jews, who denied Christianity on principle, they could not refuse admittance to the infidel. If they admitted the infidel to the same privileges and power as Christian Members, then it was an insult to those Christian Members to exact from them a profession of their faith. There was another view of the question: the Jews were a separate people by race and by religion.

After other speeches the House proceeded to the division, where there was a majority of 93 votes in favour of acceptance.[196]

Unexpectedly, there were some new and interesting speeches during the third reading. The honourable Mr. Law presented a previously unheard and complete summary of the history of the Jews in England, of which he had personally made an in-depth study. An excerpt of his speech:

---

194 *Hansard*: Volume 104, 1398. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
195 *Hansard*, Volume 104, p.1398.
196 *Hansard*, Volume 104, p. 1428. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

> To employ the eloquent language of the modern and accomplished author of the *History of the Jews:* 'Refusing still to mingle their blood with any other race of mankind, they dwell in their distinct families and communities; and still maintain, though sometimes long and utterly unconnected with each other, the principle of national unity. Jews in the indelible features of the countenance, in mental character, in customs, usages and laws, in language and literature, above all in religion, in recollections of the past, and in the hopes of the future. Denizens everywhere, rarely citizens even in the countries in which they have been the longest and most firmly established, they appear to a certain degree strangers or sojourners; they dwell apart, though mingling with neighbours in many of the affairs of life.'
>
> […]
>
> We must look therefore to some other cause than the alleged principle of this Bill for its introduction, and the urgency with which it is advocated. The fact is, that the Jews, by their connexions, can command the money market all over the world; and the money market is the secret why it is sought to admit them into this House.
>
> […]
>
> Is it from the idle notion of paying a compliment to a millionaire, who happened to be associated with the noble Lord at the head of the Government, or is it in consequence of his wealth and his influence, especially in the contracting of loans, and in the money market – that this measure was brought forward? Was it introduced from any other accident, than because he is the colleague of the noble Lord at the head of Her Majesty's Government, and a rich man well backed on the Stock Exchange?
>
> […]
>
> Why, I would venture to ask, should we break through the fundamental principles of the British constitution to pave the way for the admission of the Jews into Parliament? …the stability of the country depends – under the Supreme Disposer of events – upon the maintenance of our institutions on an exclusively Christian foundation.[197]

As well as the MPs Raphael[198] and Keogh,[199] Newdegate[200] intervened once more in the debate. His speeches are of great value and are particularly interesting, given his profound study of the works on Jewish history and his specialist knowledge of this subject. Newdegate highlighted above all the Jews' inferior character, derived from their religious principles. He was not surprised by the general support that the Jews received in Parliament given their predominance on the Stock Exchange, the principles of which had already been imported wholesale in Parliament.

The efforts made by the Opposition to thwart the bill were unsuccessful: the division went in favour of the government, at 272 votes to 106.[201]

---

197 *Hansard*, Volume 105, p. 1384. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
198 *Hansard*, Volume 105, p. 1385.
199 *Hansard*, Volume 105, p. 1386.
200 *Hansard*, Volume 105, p. 1389.
201 *Hansard*, Volume 105, p. 1430.

Once again the House of Lords became the wall of resistance which broke the assaults of the pro-Jewish faction.[202] The Bishop of Oxford was passionately opposed to the bill being passed:

> First, then, he said that there was danger, because it was impossible to measure the number of constituencies upon whom the power of money might be brought to bear in order to secure an object which might be of great importance to the Jews; and at the present time he thought it was especially dangerous to increase the representation of wealth as separate from those other considerations which ought to qualify and control the money influence. They had of late years seen the great increase of that money power in the British Legislature, without a proportionate increase of those considerations; and therefore he thought that to pass this measure, which would give the directest representation of the most immediate money power in the country, was a real, practical and great evil.[203]

The law was defeated by 95 votes to 70.[204]

202 *Hansard*, Volume 106, pp. 871-922.
203 *Hansard*, Volume 106, p. 912. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
204 *Hansard*, Volume 106, p. 920 ff.

A Repeat of the Rothschild Farce

The eight days that followed this Jewish defeat in the House of Lords were surely the most instructive of the 28 years of the struggle.

The sitting of the Lords which decisively brought down the bill began on the evening of Tuesday, June 26th, 1849. At 12.30am the debate ended with a vote. In view of the lateness of the hour, the debate was adjourned until the following day. Very early the following morning, Lionel de Rothschild resigned his seat in Parliament, triggering the need for a by-election.

Immediately afterwards, the official body responsible drew up the notice for the by-election in the City and sent it to the sheriffs, into whose hands it arrived shortly before 2 o'clock in the afternoon. A few hours later, it was made public that Nomination Day would be held on Monday, July 2nd, and that the election would take place on Tuesday, July 3rd.[205]

The speed at which these formalities were carried out is truly surprising. Surely there is no similar case recorded in all of English history – because normally it would take a few weeks. The *Standard* of July 2nd made sure to publish the notice required, while the *Morning Herald* of the same date expressed its disgust that Rothschild had stolen a march on his rival by putting up his campaign placards on the Christian Sabbath (something that Lord Manners had not been prepared to do) and stated in its editorial:

> It must convince any man of the most plain understanding that everything was long previously arranged, and every preparation duly made to take the City of London by surprise, and thus to pretend that Baron Rothschild had made a fair appeal to that constituency, and that the appeal was followed by a true and determined approval of his claim to be the representative of this great City.
>
> [Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.]

On Thursday, Rothschild's candidacy announcement was published, according to which 'justice will be done according to the forms, and in the true spirit, of the English Constitution'.[206] This infuriated the *Morning Herald* of July 29th, because, according to the newspaper, all of Rothschild's manoeuvring, from a man who had no right to occupy a seat in Parliament, was in contradiction to the constitution and the laws of Great Britain.

Every nook and cranny of the City was covered with posters for Rothschild,[207] but nowhere was seen anything similar from the Jews' adversaries, who had been caught off-guard by events, and who didn't even have time to convey to the public whether or not an opposing candidate was to fielded. Initially it was considered completely pointless to field a candidate, and only after some long debates in an assembly formed for the purpose was it decided to present Lord John Manners for the role. This decision was conveyed to the electors in the last hours of Saturday evening, June 30th, and for this reason it seemed very doubtful that Lord Manners could have published his candidacy announcement on the same day. In any case, his announcement only appeared in the

205 *Standard*, 28/6/1849, 30/6/1849, 2/7/1840; *Morning Post*, 2/7/1849.
206 *Times*, 28/6/1849. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
207 *Standard*, 29/6/1849.

newspapers on Monday, the Nomination Day itself. It explained that the election had only been staged to intimidate the House of Lords. Lord Manners would act to protect the Lords and he would try to bring down all attempts against them.[208]

The situation of the candidate chosen to challenge Rothschild was, as might be expected, far from satisfactory. While Rothschild worked with electoral propaganda which had been prepared long in advance, Lord Manners did not even have a whole day available to make his own preparations, because on a Sunday electoral campaigning hardly ever takes place in England. Rothschild, on the other hand, was in a much more favourable position, all things considered. His ethnic brethren worked for him even on Sunday, and even during church hours invaded the City with posters and election leaflets, which must have been printed only the night before, given that they most outrageously attacked Lord Manners personally.

The morning of Nomination Day saw a large crowd in the streets, formed mainly of Jews from the most disreputable districts of London. It seemed as if, on that day, not a single Jew was working at his trade. Everywhere candidacy advertisements for Rothschild, and everywhere banners inscribed with 'Civil and Religious Liberty' or 'Rothschild'. When Rothschild was presented to the crowd, a frenzy of zealous cheering broke out; on Lord John Manners being presented, the words of his friend's introduction were lost in the jeers and whistles of the crowd.

Rothschild mainly spoke of the need for the equality of rights and liberties for all. When he finished his speech, the applause never seemed to end.

In vain Lord Manners tried to explain his political principles to the crowd. Not even those closest to him were able to make out his words. When the uproar got too much even for Rothschild's friends, the head of the assembly tried to restore calm. He appealed to the gentility of those present, saying that it was un-English to not let the adversary speak. But these words appeared not to make the slightest impression on the crowd, for as soon as Lord Manners tried to resume his speech, the same uproar returned. In a final effort, Lord Manners addressed the gathering with the following words: 'This is said to be a contest for religious liberty and freedom, but it seems to me that liberty of speech is not included in liberty of conscience.'

The pre-election poll delivered a crushing majority to Rothschild, therefore the definitive election was requested for the following day.

In contrast to the first election and to ensure that things went as desired, Nomination Day saw all of Rothschild's supporters be invited to eat and drink their fill in various restaurants.[209]

On the day of the election itself, the disturbances reached even greater proportions than those of previous day. Just as in the election of 1847, the longshoremen once again dominated the terrain, with the same scenes repeated, and the bribes at least as large as before.

In addition, Rothschild worked with false electoral lists. The Conservative Association had already ascertained, long before the election took place, that some 1,400 people – with no right to vote or even deceased – had been wrongfully included on the electoral roll; this figure constituted a very high percentage of the City of London electorate at that time. The Conservative Association complained to the registration court for the City, asking for these names to be removed, which the

---

208 *Standard*, 2/7/1849; *Morning Post*, 2/7/1849; *Morning Herald*, 2/7/1849.

209 *Time*, 3/7/1849; *Standard*, 3/7/1849; *Morning Post*, 3/7/1849; *Morning Herald*, 3/7/1849; *Morning Chronicle*, 3/7/1849. Translator's note: The quotation from Lord Manners is taken verbatim from the *Morning Chronicle*, but note that his words are paraphrased differently across different newspaper titles.

president of the court rejected. However strange this may seem, it cannot be surprising when one considers that the partisanship of such public bodies had been publicly complained about for years. It was also known that the main functionary of this authority, a barrister, worked for a morning newspaper, whose editor was completely economically dependant upon Rothschild. Thus he did nothing to change such an illegal situation. Rothschild, concerned with not losing a single vote, had bought, almost without exception, all of those wrongfully registered on the list; and moreover, even men were found who were prepared to vote in the name of the deceased.

Rothschild's adversaries, who did not remain idle, were already distributing in the earliest hours of the election a leaflet which said that any votes given to Rothschild would be votes which were 'lost and thrown away', because it continued to be impossible for the Jew to take up his seat in Parliament, given his inability to swear to the last words of the oath. Besides this, as a Government contractor he could not represent the interests of the constituents.

The leaflet also made an allegation of corruption:

> We, the undersigned electors of the said city of London, do hereby give you notice that Lionel Nathan Rothschild, Esq, otherwise called Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, one of the candidates to represent the said city in Parliament at this present election, was guilty by himself or his agents, as well of bribery as of treating and other corrupt practices, at the election of the said city held in the 29th day of July, in the year 1847, and is thereby rendered ineligible and incapable of being elected to serve as a citizen in Parliament for the said city upon the present vacancy.

The leaflet carried the date of July 2nd, 1849, as well as the signatures of four citizens, made in the presence of two lawyers.

A few hours later, Rothschild and his friends arranged for a leaflet to be disseminated which contained the following professional opinion of eminent barrister and member of Parliament Matthew Davenport Hill, whose name was obviously familiar enough to electors for his statement to be signed 'M. D. Hill':

> I am of opinion, that the election of the Baron Rothschild to be member of Parliament for the city of London would be a valid election, notwithstanding his religious faith and opinions; that such election is no way affected by what has taken place in the House of Lords or elsewhere; that whether or not the Baron, if elected, shall think fit to take such oaths as will entitle him to sit and vote does not touch the question of his right to be a member, and that any notice to the electors that their votes will be thrown away in the event of their voting for the Baron Rothschild will be nugatory, and ought not to be regarded.

What is interesting to note, however, is that not the slightest effort was made to refute or at least reject the allegations of bribery and hospitality ('treating').[210]

---

210 *Times*, 4/7/1849; *Morning Herald*, 3/7/1849, 4/7/1849, 5/7/1849. Both quotations (and quoted element) reproduced verbatim from the *Times* article.

Rothschild was elected. How could it have been otherwise! With 6,017 votes to Lord Manner's 2,814, Rothschild scored a comfortable victory in the election. The rhyme published in the *Morning Herald* of July 6th, 1849 summarised the situation very well for the majority of the electors:

> Inscribe this on your banners
> (Deny it if you can),
> 'With us it is not *Manners*,
> But *money* makes the *man*.'
>
> [Reproduced verbatim from original source.]

At the solemn proclamation of the election result, Rothschild's great friend, Mr. Wire, not knowing what to do to praise him, attacked the House of Lords for its stance.[211] Analogous were the declarations of the *Sun* of July 4th, who openly threatened to sanction the House of Lords if its members had the temerity to oppose the Jew:

> Let them beware, lest in the midst of their interference with the prerogatives of the House of Commons of England, the latter should retaliate upon them *by refusing to grant the Supplies!* How foolish the Bench of Bishops would look in such a predicament! What a sorry figure the whole of the Peers would cut in such an event! And such an event is always possible, for (let it not be forgotten) the purse of the nation is in the hands of the House of Commons!
>
> [Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.]

On the same day, the *Daily News* expressed its delight and compared Lord Manner's electoral defeat to the defeat of the young Coningsby by Sidonia in a horse race.

The press of the Jews' adversaries fervently accused Rothschild of availing himself of illicit means to win the election. With ardent words the public was urged to take action against such shameless practices.

It is very interesting to note the attitude taken by the Jewish press towards these open accusations and towards the efforts made to see Rothschild prosecuted.

While the *Times* and the *Sun* maintained absolute silence – the refrain 'silence implies consent' [*Schweigen ist Zustimmung*] also applying here – the *Morning Chronicle*, the newspaper of the Rothschild court, took a careful position on the matter. In its July 7th editorial, it wholly revealed its fear of a prosecution, although naturally, it strove to create the opposite impression, as the following excerpt [reproduced verbatim from the original source] indicates:

> We believe that the attempt will fail. To the best of our information, the charge of bribery or illegal treating in 1847, is as utterly gratuitous as of bribery or illegal treating

211 *Times*, 5/7/1849.

> on Tuesday last. But assuming it to be supported by evidence, it will simply place Lord John Manners in a most embarrassing and humiliating position. It will scarcely retard the cause of toleration and enlightenment an hour; and we can hardly believe that any influential body of citizens will be found mad enough to unite in offering such an insult to the metropolis.
>
> […]
>
> We go further. In our opinion, a decision which should seat Lord John Manners, in defiance of a great constituency, might bring matters to a crisis fraught with danger…

One notices the fear alongside the implicit threats that perhaps would have been capable of unsettling the petit bourgeois fearful of his voting rights.

One rightly has to wonder what end could possibly have been achieved by Rothschild's resignation and subsequent re-election, but the motives are difficult to ascertain. The philo-Semitic press gives us a clue however: with Rothschild's expected re-election it was hoped that the House of Lords would be intimidated, by presenting it with full evidence of supposed public opinion.[212] At the same time a farce of this kind was intended to remind the English masses of the Jewish Question, given that they were always somewhat lethargic and apt to easily forget important matters. Lastly, it would give the press a good opportunity to present this issue in a comprehensible way to the man in the street. According to the *Times* of June 28th, 1849, the battle was no longer a Jewish issue and 'the Bill was not a bill for permitting Jews to sit in the House of Commons, but a bill for permitting Christians to elect them'. In other words, the backwards House of Lords had the audacity to call into question the sacred right of the freedom of the vote, even going as far as the inconceivable extreme of annulling this right with their stance. This line of argument, naturally, had to make the English citizen's blood boil, especially when he was told by the same source that it was the voting class which 'represents the principles of religious freedom and the opinions of the English people'. The City of London therefore represented the English people, in the judgement of these heroes of journalism.

212 *Times*, 28/6/1849; *Morning Chronicle*, 2/7/1849. Note that the subsequent quotations are reproduced verbatim from the original *Times* article.

The Expulsion of Rothschild

Almost a year passed before serious moves were made to capitalise on Rothschild's victory, that is to say, to get him into Parliament, which continued to be impossible due to the form of the oath, particularly the Oath of Abjuration.

On March 12th, 1850, Parliament decided to set up a committee to study the problem of the conditions under which the Jews could take up Parliamentary seats.[213] During the debates, the stance of Lord John Russell, in contrast to that of previous occasions, was not exactly oppositional, but *was* very reserved.[214] Despite the committee's work, no progress was made with the issue, and it stalled at the first reading of May 31st, 1850. In answer to a question made in Parliament on July 22nd, Lord John Russell[215] answered that in the current session new advances were very unlikely to be forthcoming.[216] We do not know the reasons that could have caused such a hesitant stance, but the newspaper of the Rothschild court expressed its dissatisfaction with this reply and continually made its displeasure known.

Rothschild himself then decided to reach his goal without further delay. On July 25th he convened an assembly in the London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, where some 500 people gathered together, among them well-known Jews, such as Montefiore, Goldsmid and Cohen, alongside, significantly, Bank of England Deputy Governor Mr. Thomson Hankey.

The *Morning Chronicle* of July 26th, 1850 described in great detail the course of events, during which Rothschild was unanimously invited to take up his seat in Parliament the following day. Lord Dudley Stuart was particularly prominent at the gathering. In his judgement, the assembly was the most important ever seen in their time, and it was necessary to finally take some drastic measures.

Despite the lateness of the hour, the news of Rothschild's decision spread throughout London at lightning speed. The Jews' adversaries in Parliament were also informed of the news around midnight.[217]

On the following day, the Commons was a completely packed house, as many members had attended only because of Rothschild's announced intention.[218] Immediately before the sitting began, Rothschild arrived with a busy entourage of electors who had wanted to accompany him on his journey.[219]

There was a great air of expectation in the Parliament. All eyes were on the doorway through which Rothschild had to enter to take up his seat in the Chamber. Up until the last minute there were some who doubted that the Jew would really have the shamelessness to force the issue of his Parliamentary seat occupancy in such a way. There was not long to wait, for soon after the sitting opened, Rothschild arrived and slowly approached the Speaker. When he came to the table to be sworn in, he was asked by the Clerk what Oath he wished to take, the Protestant or the Roman

---

213 *Hansard*, Volume 109, pp. 809-816.
214 *Hansard*, Volume 109, p. 814.
215 *Hansard*, Volume 111, pp. 487-8.
216 *Morning Chronicle*, 26/7/1850.
217 *Hansard*, Volume 113, p. 317. Translator's note: Although Aldag does not state it explicitly here, Thomson Hankey was rumoured to be of Jewish heritage.
218 *Morning Herald*, 27/7/1850.
219 *Morning Herald*, 26/7/1850.

Catholic Oath. He replied: ‘I desire to be sworn upon the Old Testament.’ Whereupon the Clerk stated the matter to the Speaker, and the Speaker directed Rothschild to withdraw. Rothschild then withdrew from the Chamber.[220]

As might be expected, the debate that followed the event, which concerned the aforementioned Jewish Question, was extraordinarily heated.

Sir Robert Inglis was no longer the only leading anti-Jewish figure, as he was now zealously supported by two younger men, Sir Frederic Thesiger and Charles Newdegate.

The first of these men was the grandson of John Andrew Thesiger, who had emigrated from Saxony to England in the middle of the 18th century. He was highly educated as a jurist and soon became famous as the most eminent barrister of his time. He occupied high offices of state. In Lord Derby’s cabinet he was named Lord Chancellor on February 26th, 1858. Later on in his career he was elevated to the Peerage, and given the title of Lord Chelmsford. It seems an irony of fate that precisely during his time the House of Lords was to fall to the Jews’ attacks; although he had never been able to overcome his aversion to the Jews, he believed that he had to vote in favour of the Jewish bill out of solidarity with the government.[221]

Charles Newdegate was as brilliant an orator as Sir Frederic, and of the same exalted academic education as his contemporary. His surname has already appeared in this history several times; in the political struggles of 1753, an ancestor in his family had taken the lead in combatting the Jews. The young Newdegate had dedicated his life exclusively to politics. He died on April 9th, 1887 and was buried in Harefield Church.[222] Contrary to Sir Frederic, he fought until the very last for his anti-Jewish beliefs. When in 1866 the last restrictions against the Jews were about to be legally annulled, as it was now only a matter of form, he defended his convictions as the leader of four other upstanding men. Perhaps at some point the day will come in England when this man is given the honour he deserves.

These two men were those who in debates continued to doggedly defend the stance that the admission of the Jews to Parliament was unacceptable for multiple reasons. The day of Rothschild’s withdrawal, the debate on that question did not reach a decision, which was why it was adjourned until the following Monday.[223]

The philo-Semitic press used its best rhetoric to call for further action. The *Times* condemned Lord John Russell’s position as too slow and not useful to the Jewish cause; the City voters, they said, could rightly be discontented with the parliamentary sitting of the previous day. It was ‘now or never’, the moment had arrived for total emancipation, the *Morning Chronicle* of July 27th predictably opined:

> There are occasions when caution is folly, when valour is the better part of discretion, when we must throw boldly and stake all, when we must burn our ships, break down the bridges in our rear, and regard retreat or escape as an impossibility. The citizens of London are placed in an emergency of this sort. Now or never, should be their cry. They will sully all their meed of former honour, won in many a hard-fought battle for civil

220 *Hansard*, Volume 113, p. 297. Translator’s note: Additional details and wording reproduced verbatim from the original source.
221 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume 19, pp. 608-9.
222 *Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume 14, pp. 331-2.
223 *Hansard*, Volume 113, pp. 297-333.

> and religious liberty, unless they force the Jew question to a prosperous issue. The game is in their own hands. They have only to screw their courage to the sticking-place. If they waver, falter, or hesitate, they are lost; and a noble cause, a great principle, is for a period lost with them.
>
> [Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.]

It need hardly be said that the adversary press condemned Rothschild's move in the strongest terms.

The following Monday in Parliament, the battle became heated once more. A majority forced a resolution that the Speaker was to ask Rothschild if he would be disposed to be sworn in on the Old Testament, in which case the swearing-in ceremony could take place in the aforesaid form.[224] But due to the lateness of the hour the act was put off until the next day.

The joy of the philo-Semitic press was boundless. Finally the end of the argument was in sight and victory was no longer far-off. On the following day Rothschild would be sworn in on the Old Testament and then he could take up his seat. 'Why hadn't it been done this way from the start?'[225]

Seemingly, the government had worked closely with Rothschild and chosen the most appropriate route to exclude all possible influence from the House of Lords.[226]

With the same level of tension as the previous day, the sitting of Tuesday, July 30th began. Once again Rothschild approached the Speaker and newly requested authorisation to be sworn in on the Old Testament. This time he did not need to leave the Chamber; rather an assistant very courteously handed him a copy of the Old Testament, which he had to hold in his hand during the swearing-in ceremony. Rothschild, Lord John Russell and many like-minded others, saw themselves finally at the end goal. With impotent obstinacy the men surrounding Sir Frederic Thesiger and Newdegate remained seated.

Sure of victory and encouraged by his friends, Rothschild swore the Oath of Allegiance and the Oath of Supremacy.[227] All that remained was the Oath of Abjuration. As with the previous oaths, the words were said, which he repeated without hesitation. Now he was almost over the finish line… then the words 'upon the true faith of a Christian' were heard. In the midst of a sepulchral silence came Rothschild's reply: 'I omit these words as not binding on my conscience.' He then went on to conclude the oath with his own words: 'So help me God.'

Friend and enemy alike were stunned into silence. In the silence of the assembly the clear voice of the Speaker rang out, and he directed Rothschild to withdraw from the Chamber. Rothschild, although hesitant, was getting ready to leave, when one of the most actively philo-Semitic members, a Mr. Hume, rose up from his seat in protest, saying to the Speaker that Rothschild had sworn the oaths in the due form. Then the Jews' adversaries recovered their senses. It appeared that they could not believe that such a skilfully prepared attack, which looked guaranteed to work, was going to be repulsed yet again. In a deafening hullabaloo of shouting they gave free rein to their joy and to their long pent-up anger. Once more did friend and enemy strive to

---

224 *Hansard*, Volume 113, pp. 397-437.
225 *Times*, 30/7/1850; *Sun*, 30/7/1850; *Morning Chronicle*, 30/7/1850.
226 *Hansard*, Volume 113, p. 486.
227 Oath of Allegiance, Oath of Supremacy. [Footnote as per original German text.]

express their opinions, and after a third night spent on this topic the debate was once more adjourned.[228]

What a different tableau in the press the following morning! The inexpressible heady joy had transformed into the deepest affliction, and the bitterest disillusionment was replaced by renewed confidence. The philo-Semitic newspapers desperately asked what was going to happen. Would a new election be required in the City? Would Rothschild have to wait for a new law to be passed for the oath's wording to be modified?[229]

In the opposing camp, as might be expected, there reigned the greatest joy. The *Morning Herald* of July 31st opined that ultimately, Rothschild's repeated failures were no surprise, given that, even though a Jew may become immensely rich, he would never learn to conduct himself like a gentleman:

> Why cannot a Jew, however wealthy, however educated, learn the habits and feelings of a gentleman? Why cannot he understand that frankness, straightforwardness and a noble simplicity, are among the very first requisites of a man who desires honourably to elevate himself among his fellow creatures?
>
> We might as well ask, why the majority of our brothel-keepers, spunging-house-keepers, and keepers of 'hells', have always been Jews? It is part of their punishment – it is one among many other invincible proofs that the Sacred Books, of which they have been made the guardians and witnesses, and in very deed the Word of God; inasmuch as, more than three thousand years ago, all these characteristics, and their attendant contempt and scorn, were minutely predicted of them.
>
> […]
>
> The Jew who consults his true dignity will not stoop to regard with the least attention the politics of the *Goyim*. Were a really religious Jew of Poland or Germany to be desired to take a share in the affairs of state of those countries, he would regard the proposal as an insult. Mr Rothschild only desires to mingle in English politics because he is not a religious Jew.
>
> And this low aim, and low standard of feeling, mark every step he takes. Never would he have been in a position to fence with the House of Commons, had he not first used means to gain his seat which no high-minded man would for a moment contemplate. And what has his conduct during the last three days been? Has it not been marked by that mixture of audacity and cunning, which is the secret of modern Jewish success; but which is so peculiarly revolting to every properly constituted mind?…
>
> [Quotation taken verbatim from original source.]

Evidently the government had to pay heed to the public uproar. On August 1st, the Attorney-General announced a motion for the August 5th sitting, in accordance with which Rothschild would be prohibited from occupying his seat before swearing the Oath of Abjuration, and that Parliament would 'at the earliest opportunity in next Session of Parliament, take into its serious consideration

228 *Hansard*, Volume 113, pp. 486-533. Translator's note: Rothschild quotations as per original source.
229 *Times*, 31/7/1850; *Morning Chronicle*, 31/7/1850; *Sun*, 31/7/1850.

the form of the Oath of Abjuration, with a view to relieve Her Majesty's Subject professing the Jewish Religion'.[230] This motion was passed by the House.[231]

A carefully crafted plan by the Jews and their allies had failed yet again, which meant that it was necessary to win over the House of Lords to achieve the legal amendment, which would have to take still more time. It is likely that they would have wanted to work unofficially to attain the majority in the House of Lords, but perhaps there were also unknown reasons which impeded immediate action. In any case, it was not until April 8th, 1851 that there was a motion from Lord John Russell to appeal the resolution of August 5th, 1850, according to which His Majesty's subjects of Jewish faith had to be allowed to take the Oath of Abjuration without the fatal last words. Already by the following day the first reading took place.[232]

Once again the heated debates in Parliament began.[233] The Jews' adversaries were indignant that this question kept coming up so often, and they considered it to be illegal pressure on the House of Lords, which so many times had voted against Jewish emancipation, yet which found its views snubbed by this very inconsiderate insistence from the philo-Semitic camp. In an elegant speech, Newdegate said:

> It could not be forgotten that Baron Rothschild had come to the table of that House, and had gone through the oath until he came to the words 'on the true faith of a Christian'; but he did not stop at those words, but, omitting them, he had ventured, on his own authority and in his own case, to alter the substance of the oath… the Speaker, in that grave, dignified and impartial manner in which he discharged all the business of that House, told the hon. Member that he had been guilty of a grave irregularity… The election in 1848, in the city of London, had been too much under the influence of the long purse of the Baron Rothschild, and the number of Jews who resided there… The Jewish religion was not the religion of the Bible, but the religion of the Talmud. It was neither more nor less than the religion of the Pharisees, perpetuated, through the Talmud, down to the present time… He would ask the honourable and learned Member whether he had ever considered the morality inculcated in the Talmud?… It allows men to detain what they know does not belong to them, if it only belongs to a Gentile… Poland might serve as a warning example of the fact that in all Christian countries where the Jews were allowed a wide sphere of political operation, corrupting and destroying elements were introduced and propagated in society, to the ruin of the State at large. In Poland one-tenth of the population were Jews, and he need not say that she was perhaps the most miserable nation in the world…[234]

230 *Hansard*, Volume 113, p. 674. Translator's note: Quoted section reproduced verbatim from original source.
231 *Hansard*, Volume 113, pp. 814-7.
232 *Hansard*, Volume 115, pp. 1006-1019, 1030.
233 *Hansard*, Volume 116, pp. 367-412; Volume 117, pp. 1096-1102.
234 *Hansard*, Volume 116, p. 368 ff. Translator's note: This is Aldag's extremely abridged précis of a 16-page-long speech, which was evidently seen as important enough to the public to be published contemporaneously as a booklet. Details of this booklet (available online) can be found in the Translator's Bibliography. The excerpts here are reproduced verbatim from the original source.

The division ended with a very thin majority in favour of the law being passed.[235] The philo-Semites achieved a majority of only 25 votes; this figure had never been so low, it being likely that many members had felt so indignant on seeing the tactic to force emancipation that they went over to the side of the Jews' adversaries. In any case it had been noticed that opposition had grown in Parliament and also in the country. At the end of June new deliberations took place regarding the form of the law, and July 3rd saw the final reading in Parliament.[236]

On this occasion, as always, the Jewish attack failed in the House of Lords. Nothing could alter this course, not even the argument expounded by the Bishop of Norwich, according to whom the previous stance of the majority of the Upper Chamber had to derive from 'that wicked and persecuting spirit towards their Jewish brethren, which was the reproach of Christendom in former times'. On July 17th, 1851, the bill approved by the Commons was defeated at the second Lords reading.[237]

235 *Hansard*, Volume 116, p. 409.
236 *Hansard*, Volume 116, pp. 1096-1102, Volume 118, pp. 142-7.
237 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 859-909. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source (p. 902).

For a Second Time: David Salomons

Although in the aforementioned way it had again been shown, as so many times before, that the admission of the Jews was not desired, the Jews did not take any lesson from that fact.[238]

Shortly before the decisive reading of the bill to modify the Oath of Abjuration in favour of Jews, when fierce battles would break out in Parliament and the public would again take a lively interest in the Jewish Question, news spread that David Salomons, regardless of the fruitless attempts that he had made up until that point, was returning to stand as a Parliamentary candidate for Greenwich in the elections that were to be held on June 27th.

The Jews' adversaries were beside themselves, especially in view of the fact that the Conservative Party appeared unwilling to field a candidate: it was disgrace for this locality, so famous as a geographical centre, to be represented by a Jew.[239] We cannot but reproduce part of the article published in the *Morning Herald* of June 23rd, which, to mark the candidacy of Salomons, dealt with the Jewish Question in general and made the following declarations, which we fancy could have been written today:

> In this country they [the Jews] are but wayfarers, dwelling here only through accidental circumstances. They are English Jews, just as elsewhere they may be French or German Jews, but they can scarcely be called Jewish Englishmen. Is it for the welfare of this kingdom to make men legislators whose sympathies are centered in another land? Who take up their abode wherever a thriving trade can be pursued – to whom political freedom is nothing, save as it promotes their commerce or secures their gains? Wherever the Jew thrives the most surely, there is the land of his temporary adoption – his counting-house is his country, and his most cherished political aspirations (apart from Jerusalem) mostly confined to matters which affect the fluctuations of the Stock Exchange… Nationally, however, they have no sympathies with us; they are among us, but they are not of us, and it is far from evident how this country will be benefited by advancing them to power.
>
> [Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.]

In the meantime, Nomination Day arrived. Besides Salomons, Mr. Chambers and Mr. Wire presented themselves as candidates. To general surprise, Mr. Chambers withdrew on the eve of the election for no apparent reason, and Mr. Wire undertook the fight against Salomons alone. He was the one who, in 1847, after the first election of Rothschild, could not have made himself more prominent in celebrating that great day. But, even disregarding that fact, it was widely known that he obeyed the Jews completely. London's organised Jewry deputised him for missions of every type. Once they even sent him to Jerusalem for an extended period. For such reasons, as the *Morning Herald* stated, it could surprise no-one that 'he has acquired a certain Israelitish taint'.[240]

---

238 *Hansard*, Volume 118, p. 984.

239 *Morning Post*, 23/6/1851, 27/6/1851; *Morning Herald*, 24/6/1851, 26/6/1851.

240 *Morning Herald*, 17/7/1851. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source. In the same issue Wire is also deemed to be 'little better than a Jew "once removed"', and the elector's choice to be between 'a Jew and his shadow'.

The election was awaited with the greatest tension as it was wondered if it were possible that Salomons really would win, 'cost what it may, by dint of the beer-cask and the brandy-bottle'.[241]

The sun beat down from a crystal-clear blue sky when the electors and the curious gathered in the square of St. Alfege Church. A large number of dodgy-looking characters had been specially stationed in front of the speakers' tribunes, and they were making an atrocious racket. One could not help but get the impression that many of them were no longer in their right mind. As will be shown later, Salomons had not restrained his spending and had invited everyone to drink beer and brandy to their fill, just as he had advertised. It was natural, therefore, that the guests expressed their gratitude by silencing Salomons' adversaries with an infernal uproar. To achieve a still greater effect, Salomons had arranged for a battery of bells to be given out, which were well used by the mob to hail their benefactor and drown out with a 'deafening clang' any awkward questions put to 'Alderman Shalomonsh' as the *Morning Herald* dubbed him. [Translator's note: This rendering of Salomons' name is to leave the readership in no doubt that the electors who voted for Salomons were very much 'bemused with beer', after such liberal 'treating'.]

As the pre-election poll came out in favour of Salomons – and nothing else could have been expected, given the composition of the crowd – the opposing party saw to it that the definitive election was set for the next day.[242] This election barely differed from that of Nomination Day: once more the drinks flowed in rivers, paid out of Salomons' pocket, and even cold hard cash was handed out to get votes.[243]

It cannot be surprising, therefore, that Salomons came out on top this time. Among the totality of the votes, some 1,500 abstentions were registered, which the *Morning Herald* of July 17th, 1851 rightly attributed to the fact that 'they [the voters] could not recognise in the two candidates any opposition sufficiently antagonistic between Jew and Christian to induce them to vote at all…'.

On Saturday, June 28th, at 11 o'clock in the morning, the Greenwich election result was published. The huge crowd who had gathered found out that Salomons had won 2,165 votes; Wire, by contrast, only 1,278. Salomons presented himself to his excited electors, whose 'hurrahs' never wanted to end. He conveyed his steadfast decision to go to Parliament the following week. He only had to relax for a few days after the hard work of the election, and besides, he had to agree with the government on the most appropriate day to appear, in order not to disturb any important debates that already been organised.

Then it came to Wire's turn to speak. He expressed that, as a matter of principle, he had carried out the electoral battle only by licit means. The methods which his adversary had resorted to, he himself had rejected, which meant that he had not bought votes, nor had restaurants or taverns open, nor arranged for groups of musicians. His words were received with a deafening wall of shouting and only with the greatest effort was he able to finish his speech. Immediately afterwards, Salomons stood forward to speak, not to reject Wire's accusations, but only to give thanks to the returning officers who had been present at the election. A roar of approval rose up from the crowd, and the solemn declaration of the election results was finished.

The press of the Jews' adversaries did as much as they could to inform the public of the methods employed by the Jews. They did not go as hard on the electors of Greenwich as they could

241 *Morning Herald*, 26/6/1851. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
242 *Daily News*, 27/6/1851; *Morning Herald*, 17/7/1851.
243 *Standard*, 17/7/1851, 22/2/1853; *Morning Herald*, 17/7/1851; *Morning Post*, 30/6/1851.

have, as they considered it understandable that the electors had little choice, and 'if they *were* to have a Jew they might as well have "the real thing"'. As the *Standard* explained it:

> The result of the Greenwich election is no otherwise unsatisfactory than that it proves the borough to be in a state so degraded that no sincerely Christian man, otherwise eligible, would offer himself to the electors. If the choice of the respectable electors has fallen upon a Jew, it was because the contest lying between a Jew and a gentleman who has for a long time acted as the partizan of Jews, they preferred the Jew, we suppose upon the same principle upon which *Macbeth* says, 'let *them* appear' when, questioned by the ladies met in his morning walk, whether he preferred to be instructed by the ladies themselves or '*by their masters*.'[244]

Despite his best intentions, Salomons did not present himself in Parliament as soon as he had stated. It would appear that the government, who looked upon him kindly, made him change his mind, as on July 3rd Lord John Russell communicated to the House of Commons that Salomons wished to give up his plan until the House of Lords dealt, one way or another, with the Jewish bill which was pending approval.[245]

As is known, late into the evening of July 17th the bill was defeated by the House of Lords. All of the newspapers published articles about this event. *Would Salomons dare go to Parliament and renew the determined struggle of so many years?*, asked the *Morning Herald*. The *Times* of the same day, evidently as well informed as always, answered the question in this way: 'There is not the least doubt that they [the Jews] will do it. Their vitality and their tenacity will always overcome every setback…'

The sitting of July 18th in the House of Commons was about to take place. No sooner had the Speaker opened proceedings than Salomons appeared and determinedly approached the Speaker, of whom he asked permission to take the three oaths on the Old Testament. His wish was granted. The first two oaths were taken without difficulty, but he substituted the fateful words of the last oath with the phrase 'so help me God'. Afterwards he took out a piece of paper and read the declaration that the last words of the Oath of Abjuration were not binding on his conscience, but that he had otherwise fulfilled all of the legal requirements and had a right, therefore, to take up his seat.

The clerk informed the Speaker that the final words of the oath had not been pronounced and that the document read out by Salomons had been handed over, at which point the Speaker declared: 'The honourable member has not heeded the prescribed form of the oath, for which reason it is my duty to direct him to withdraw to behind the bar [the Bar of the House].'

Salomons had followed the course of events very nervously, and became yet more nervous. But, to widespread surprise, he did not pay attention to the Speaker's direction. Of course, he hesitatingly moved away from the Speaker's table, but he sat down on the bench immediately below the ministerial bench, beside the member Sir W. Molesworth. This immediately triggered a

---

244 *Standard*, 28/6/1851; *Morning Post*, 30/6/1851; *Morning Herald*, 17/7/1851 (from which the first quoted element is taken). Translator's note: The quotation from the *Standard* has been inserted into the text due to its perceived interest to the reader, and as an exemplar of English wit. As with the *Morning Herald*, the *Morning Post* strongly infers that the electoral outcome was determined by the copious amounts of alcohol provided by the winning candidate.

245 *Morning Herald*, 4/7/1851.

deafening racket, mixed with loud cries of ‘Withdraw!’ and ‘Order!’. The commotion continued to get worse by the second and reached a crescendo when it was noticed that Salomons was trying to talk to the Strangers’ Gallery: a second violation of the rigorous rules of the House, surely never before seen in English history. The anger of the Jews’ adversaries was now beyond measure.

It was only after some considerable time that the Speaker managed to restore order, and he once again directed Salomons to leave the Chamber, given that he had not taken the Oath of Abjuration in the prescribed form.

Salomons stood up and went towards the bar, before which he stopped again, hesitating. Once more an indescribable tumult rose up, once more shouts were heard of ‘Withdraw!’ and ‘Order!’, and Mr. John Abel Smith approached him and led him out to behind the bar. Salomons remained there.

Meanwhile, Sir Benjamin Hall had got up and declared himself in support of Salomons, saying that he would submit to the Speaker’s request. When he tried to make a new declaration, he was interrupted by Sir Frederic Thesiger, who had stood up and asked the Speaker for permission to take the floor. Once more returned the deafening commotion. When members from the opposite side called him to order, he shouted that it was precisely of order that he wished to speak. ‘I apprehend,’ he continued, ‘that the worthy alderman has not obeyed the order of this house’ (cheers from his fellows on the Opposition benches). ‘He has not withdrawn, but is at present standing within the house, and it is my duty to call the attention of the house to that circumstance.’

Despite the third direction from the Speaker, Salomons continued to stand irresolutely between the bar and the door of the Chamber. Finally he went up the steps to the Lords’ Gallery, on the left-hand side of the door on entering, and stayed there for the remainder of the discussion.[246]

After order had been restored, Sir Benjamin Hall asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, standing in for the Prime Minister, whether he would instruct the Attorney-General to prosecute Salomons for his conduct. The Chancellor, in consideration of the absence of the Prime Minister Lord John Russell, stated that it would be best to defer an answer to that question.[247]

After some skirmishes between the supporters and the adversaries of the Jews, it was agreed to adjourn the debate until Monday, July 21st.

Immediately before this sitting began, the Jew Salomons was once more observed, this time already seated expectantly behind the bar. A repressed tension reigned in the Chamber. The places for spectators were full, and outside there was a packed crowd of those who had not managed to gain entry. Everyone anxiously awaited what would happen.

After the opening of Parliament, the Speaker read out a letter from Salomons requesting, among other things, the rectification of Friday’s protocol; he rejected all of Salomon’s requests out of hand, and no member contradicted him.

Immediately afterwards, the House passed to the order of business. As first speaker, Sir Benjamin Hall asked the Prime Minister, now present, if the government would instruct the Attorney-General to prosecute Salomons for his conduct of the previous Friday. Lord John Russell

246 *Standard*, 19/7/1851. *Hansard*, Volume 118, p. 979 ff. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from the newspaper article.
247 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 981-2.

answered no, ‘but he reserved to himself the discretion of doing so hereafter should circumstances appear to warrant such a course of procedure’.[248]

Barely had he announced this decision when Salomons crossed onto the floor of the house and sat on the front bench, which was reserved solely for ministers. This unleashed a deafening furore, which was more intense and lasted longer than that of the previous Friday, After a certain calm had been restored, the Speaker exhorted Salomons to leave the chamber immediately. But Salomons did not give the slightest indication of moving from his seat.

During the resultant deafening uproar, the Prime Minister got up, evidently with the intention of speaking, but all of his efforts were in vain and he did not manage to say a single word.

The member Chisholm Amstey was seen passing a piece of paper to the Speaker and then talking to him. Only after considerable time was the President able to establish even a modicum of order. As a first thing, he announced that the honourable gentleman Mr. Amstey had tabled a motion which he regretted having to reject.

Then Lord Russell got up once again, but just as before, his attempt to take the floor was condemned to failure, due to the roar of shouting that started up again with all of its earlier intensity. Resigning himself to this fact, he sat down again. Salomons continued impassive in his seat, although he did shoot the odd fearful glance towards the angry faces of his adversaries, whose shouts of ‘Withdraw!’ continued to ring in his ears.

The Right Honourable Speaker, out of his wits, who surely had never believed that such a thing could ever be possible in the English Parliament, tried to restore order through gestures. He requested that the Chamber and the government help him to expel Salomons. Hurrahs and other signs of approval followed.

Once more Lord Russell rose from his seat and managed, finally, to make himself heard. It would appear that he too had come to find the situation disagreeable, and to everyone’s surprise personally requested ‘that the honourable member withdraw’. This was met by a cacophony of shouts of approval from the Jews’ adversaries.

Sir Robert Inglis supported the motion. This was surely the first agreement between these two adversaries regarding the Jewish Question.

But with equal speed a motion from Mr. Bernal Osborne came from the other side of the Chamber, asking that Salomons be admitted in due form and that he be authorised to occupy his seat. The motion was supported by Mr. Amstey. A new uproar, and between constant interruptions the latter tried to explain his stance. Meanwhile the Speaker strove to expel some unknown individuals from the House – among them most certainly Jews – who tried to cross into the members-only part of the Chamber. The whole scene was one of indescribable confusion.

Finally Mr. Amstey finished his statement and asked for the debate to be adjourned. Salomons continued unperturbed in his place. They then moved to a vote on Amstey’s motion, which was defeated by a crushing majority.

To the horror and displeasure of most of the Chamber, it was seen that Salomons had had the audacity to vote as well,[249] which contravened the traditional rules in two ways: on the one hand

248 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 1143-5. Translator’s note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from the *Standard*, 22/7/1851. Note that the *Morning Post* of 22/7/1851 reproduces Salomon’s letter in full.

249 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 1145-1148. Wolf: *Essays…*, p. 332. Goldsmid, A.: *Report…*, p. iv.

because, as the Speaker had explained to him, he did not have the right to be in the Parliament, much less to vote; on the other, because members never intervened in the decisions which involved them directly.[250]

The commotion continued almost uninterrupted and even the public took part in it to an extent that had never been seen, for which reason the Speaker ordered the galleries to be cleared.[251]

The Speaker wanted Bernal Osborne's motion to be voted on straight away, when he was interrupted by a member who wished to make a statement on this intention. Thunderous protests came from most of the members and speeches were aborted due to the incessant noise. As so many times before, comments were made on the pros and cons of Jewish admission, and worthy of being cited is a warning from the honourable gentleman Mr. Bright, according to whom Queen Victoria herself had a burning desire to see the question settled in favour of the Jews.[252]

Once more the House was nearing a vote on the motion. Immediately beforehand, Salomons, who was still present, announced, through the mediation of the member John Abel Smith, that on this occasion he would leave the Chamber for the division, but that all decisions would be reserved on the outcome of subsequent events. After this resolution was announced, Salomons got up, bowed to the Speaker, and left the Chamber. Bernal Osborne's motion was defeated by a considerable majority.[253]

No sooner was the division over than Salomons, under the shout of protest from his adversaries, came bank into the Chamber and took up his previous position on the ministers' bench.

The member Amstey repeated his request for an adjournment, which was met, to general surprise, by the forceful protests of Lord Russell. Salomons then stood up to speak. This sparked an inconceivable tumult and only after a good while did he managed to make himself heard. The shouts of 'Withdraw!' did not stop. Finally, one could make out a part of his speech. He said that his attitude was not due, in any way, to an irreverence towards the Speaker, but to the fact that by his conduct he only wanted to defend the rights which, in his judgement, were rightfully his.

There followed speeches from other members. The division resulted in a majority defeating Amstey's motion to suspend the sitting. Immediately afterwards, the Speaker called for another vote, this time on Lord Russell's earlier motion concerning Salomons' expulsion. This resulted in a crushing majority in favour of expulsion.

Nor on this occasion did Salomons have the slightest qualm about casting his vote in both divisions.[254]

The Speaker then expressed his confidence that 'the hon. Member for Greenwich had heard the decision of the House, and hoped that he was prepared to obey it'.

However, as is read in the Parliamentary minutes: 'Mr. Alderman Salomons continuing to sit in his seat, Mr. Speaker directed the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove him below the bar. Whereupon the Serjeant-at-Arms having placed his hand on Mr. Alderman Salomons, he was conducted below the bar.'[255]

---

250 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 1205-6.
251 *Hansard*, Volume 118, p. 1163.
252 *Hansard*, Volume 118, p. 1199.
253 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 1205-8.
254 Goldsmid, A.: *Report…*, p. VIII. Wolf: *Essays…*, p. 333.
255 *Hansard*, Volume 118, p. 1216. Translator's note: Both quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.

As a result, Salomons had pushed things so far because he had every intention of forcing his removal, behaviour which in reality only a Jew is capable of.

The sitting, which went on into the small hours of the morning, ended with a question from Mr. Bernal Osborne, who asked if the noble lord would direct Mr. Salomons to be prosecuted. The Prime Minister answered, to cheers and roars of laughter, that if the honourable member for Greenwich really wished to be prosecuted, he had no doubt that he would find plenty of persons willing to do it for him. Once more, then, the idea of a trial was deftly rejected. Due to the lateness of the hour, an agreement was reached to adjourn the debate,[256] and on July 22nd they returned to work extensively on the matter, likewise debating until deep into the night. Salomons, also present at this new sitting, was now seated in the front row of the gallery, a row which was normally occupied by the Peers of England.[257] After much to-ing and fro-ing, the debate was adjourned yet again.[258]

On July 28th the debate resumed, and it began with the reading of a letter from Salomons dated July 25th. The letter contained the message that two charges had already been made against him for his conduct in Parliament.

It then went on to discuss the request made on the same date by the Greenwich electors, who asked that they be granted authorisation to be represented by a lawyer, to demonstrate before Parliament their right to elect whomsoever they wished as a member of Parliament. At the same time a petition had been presented of behalf of the electors of the City of London asking that it be permitted for Rothschild to take up his seat and that a lawyer of recognised standing be likewise admitted to the House in order to take part in the pertinent debates. As can be seen, the cooperation between both Jewish electoral districts was working perfectly.

Both requests were dealt with separately, but, after heated debates, the majority rejected every demand made in each. A motion requesting the modification of the Oath of Abjuration was also defeated by a majority of 38 votes, and a request, according to which Salomons would not be authorised to occupy his seat before having taking this oath in the due form, was passed by 123 votes to 68.[259]

Every reader will concur that this was the longest and most tenacious attack from the Jews.

We ourselves believe that Salomons' behaviour is frankly monstrous, and the press response to it is interesting.

What is surprising is that the *Times* dedicated few column inches to the events, instead writing merely about the theoretics of the problem in general, without going into details about the real-life case that was actually happening. In their opinion, it was now time to settle the problem through the mediation of the courts of justice.[260]

The *Daily News* attributed the tumultuous scenes in Parliament only to the House of Lords' position, a completely deplorable situation in the newspaper's opinion, because the House of Commons represented the whole nation, whereas the House of Lords were only representative of a small class. But in the course of the subsequent development of events, it believed that the conduct

256 *Hansard*, Volume 118, p. 1217.
257 *Standard*, 23/7/1851.
258 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 1318-66.
259 *Hansard*, Volume 118, pp. 1573-1629.
260 *Times*, 21/7/1851, 22/7/1851, 28/7/1851, 30/7/1851.

of Salomons and his ethnic brethren had gone too far, which was why it distanced itself from them.[261]

The *Spectator* and the *Observer* described Salomons' behaviour as imprudent and not at all productive to the cause of emancipation.[262]

To cut a long story short, we cannot quite shake off the impression that the vast majority of the philo-Semitic press received the events in Parliament with great displeasure. Thus one notices their efforts to avoid informing on the events to the greatest extent possible. The same tendency appears to prevail in the *Manchester Guardian*, although it could not help but admire Salomons' courage:

> But, whatever may be said of Mr. Alderman Salomons, at least it must be admitted that he has shown great courage and fearlessness of the consequences in thus pressing his pretensions to a practical conclusion – at no small risk and hazard to himself.[263]

The anti-Jewish press brutally condemned Salomons' behaviour, as was expressed most notably in the *Morning Post* and the *Standard*. In their editorials of the 19th, 22nd and 23rd of July, 1851, they describe the insolent behaviour of this gentleman and his friends, and state that it would be near impossible to be able to find such a shameful event in the history of the House of Commons.

They saw the greatest insolence in the fact that Salomons not only had had the audacity to appear in Parliament, but also to vote. The *Morning Post* of July 19th wrote:

> Mr Salomons has the folly and impertinence to defy Lords and Commons alike, and to set up against the statutes of the realm, of which he calls himself a faithful subject – his own opinion on his own cause.
>
> [Quotation taken verbatim from the original source.]

The *Standard* gave a lavishly detailed account of events. It was disgusted to the highest degree that Salomons, as an outsider, had had the temerity to conduct himself in such a manner and had not been satisfied with only one illicit appearance in Parliament.

> A renewal of Mr. Salomons' impudent attempt caused a repetition of the bear garden scene in the House of Commons last night, if possible more disorderly and disgusting than the scene of the night before. The proceedings were as riotous and irreverent as the exhibition presented by worshippers in a Jewish synagogue; and every one who has witnessed that knows what such a scene means.[264]

---

261 *Daily News*, 22/7/1851, 23/7/1851, 24/7/1851.
262 *Spectator*, 26/7/1851; *Observer*, 20/7/1851.
263 *Manchester Guardian*, 23/7/1851. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
264 *Standard*, 19/7/1851, 22/7/1851, 23/7/1851, 29/7/1851. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from the 23/7/1851 issue. A Bear Garden was a venue in which bear-baiting, bull-baiting, and other unsavoury animal and human blood sports took place. There were various such arenas in existence in London between 1576 and 1835.

Salomons' participation in the sittings had consequences in the law courts. There existed a law dating from the time of King George I which imposed severe penalties for such contraventions. Accordingly, anyone who broke this law would have to pay £500 in each instance. This law would also see him divested of many rights, among them the right to be a guardian of minors, which meant that in such circumstances he could not legally represent even his own children. In addition, he could not seek legal protection for attacks against his property, nor would he have the right to demand the return of assets which had been taken from him. Finally, he was deprived of the right to occupy official positions or to take part in elections, which meant that the man thus condemned found himself in worse circumstances than the man dispossessed of civil rights today.[265] As a consequence, if he were to be found guilty, the consequences for Salomons would necessarily be extremely grave.

As the government, despite this law, did not proceed against Salomons for unknown reasons, two private individuals raised separate lawsuits against him, each asking for the law to be applied. One of the lawsuits was withdrawn, probably as the result of an agreement between the litigating parties; the other, by contrast, was taken to the Court of Exchequer, under the case title *Miller vs. Salomons*.

On December 9th, 1851, the pre-trial hearing was held in front of four barons [judges] and a special jury. After a brief round of arguments, it was decided to take the matter to the plenary session, given the importance of the question.[266]

On January 26th and 28th, 1852, the case was formally heard. Salomons had hired for his defence no less than three barristers, among whom figured his ethnic kinsman Augustus Goldsmid. In the course of the judgement, the accuser, according to the accused, withdrew two of the accusations and the judgement was limited to a single event, allegedly to simplify proceedings.[267]

Salomons defended himself mainly by expressing that, in his judgement, he had had the right to remain in the debating chamber, and even to vote during the debate, because he had sworn the oaths in terms of their essential elements. He declared that the final words 'on the true faith of a Christian' could not be considered an essential element, which meant that it did not matter whether such words had been omitted or not. Moreover, the law regarding the Oath of Abjuration was no longer in effect and by a special dispensation of 1838 it had been permitted for him to swear the oath in the form in which he had sworn it.[268]

The public took a lively interest in the arguments. To widespread surprise and against English custom, after long deliberation the verdict was not made public at the end of the session, nor the following day. The reason given by the Chief Baron of the Exchequer [the presiding judge] was the following, according to newspaper reports: 'as it involved questions of great importance, the Court, with reference to that and to the great length of the argument, would wish to consider its judgment, in order that they might have an opportunity of looking over the acts. The judgment, without pledging themselves to any particular day, would be given shortly.'[269]

---

265 *Hansard*, Volume 121, pp. 190-1.
266 Goldsmid, A.: *Report*, p. XI.
267 Goldsmid, A.: *Report*, p. 66.
268 Goldsmid, A.: *Report*, p. 24 ff. Translator's note: Quoted element as per original source.
269 *Times*, 27/1/1852, 29/1/1852. *Morning Herald*, 27/1/1852, 29/1/1852. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from the *Times* 29/1/1852 issue.

It was still a long time waiting for the verdict, which was eventually published on April 19th. It went against Salomons. According to its terms, he not only had to pay a fine of £500, but it also added the aforementioned penalties, such as the exclusion from official posts, etc.

In accordance with English procedure, in a collegial court each judge has to make known his views on the case. Thus it was found that, of the four judges, one had found the accusation unjustified, opining that the final words of the Oath of Abjuration could not be considered a touchstone of the Christianity of whoever took the oath, as it had only been introduced with the goal of ensuring that it would bind the conscience of Catholics even tighter. For this reason, he considered it absolutely absurd that these words be demanded of a Jew, and its omission could have no bearing on the legality of the oath.[270]

By contrast, the other judges, including the presiding judge Lord Chief Justice Baron Pollock, considered the final part of the oath to be important and indispensable, without which the oath could have no value at all.[271]

The public, which must surely have included influential men of the England of those days, had followed the various judgements very attentively. In the camp of the Jews and their allies the greatest sense of consternation prevailed, while the adversaries applauded with satisfaction the verdict's reasoning, reasoning which demonstrated that the Jews were not capacitated to take up seats in Parliament:

> Baron Rothschild, in London, and Mr. Salomons in Greenwich, ought now to bow to the supremacy of the law, and to withdraw their claims. A solemn decision has been given that the law permits them not to sit in Parliament. Such being the case, to persist in getting returned, simply (as both of these gentlemen *were* returned) by the weight of the purse – is to express a plain resolution that the law shall be altered, not because it ought to be altered, or because the people of England wish it altered – but because two or three wealthy Jews resolve that it shall be altered; and carry out that resolution by a pertinacious assault on the firmness of the two houses…[272]

Salomons lodged an appeal, which was debated by the Court of Exchequer Chamber in 1853. The appeal was unanimously rejected as groundless, leaving the lower court's sentence in place. The then Chief Justice, Lord Campbell, a declared philo-Semite who occupied the presidency, could not reject the lower court's findings. In an addendum to his pronouncement, he emphasised how much he regretted the legal situation, but that he hoped that this would be modified in favour of the Jews.[273] Lord Campbell's attitude is perfectly understandable when one takes into account that even in the House of Lords he had declared himself proud to call Salomons his friend.[274]

In 1854, Salomons presented a 'writ of error' – a type of legal order – to the House of Lords as the final court of appeal, of which more shall be discussed later. Neither in 1855 nor in 1856 was any decision made. On July 21st, 1857, Lord Campbell asked the House of Lords if the writ was going be determined or dismissed, and in the case of it being determined, when the hearing was to

270 Goldsmid, A.: *Report*…, pp. 66, 94.
271 Goldsmid, A.: *Report*…, pp. 94-134.
272 *Morning Herald*, 20/4/1852. Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
273 Henriques: p. 276.
274 *Hansard*, Volume 147, p. 108.

take place. The need for a decision was pressing, because public opinion, that up until recently had been in harmony with the anti-Jewish stance of the Lords, was starting to show certain changes, particularly in the previously anti-Jewish spheres of Conservatism. This observation from a philo-Semite is very interesting because, if it is correct, then public opinion must have been anti-Jewish at least until July 1857. Later in the same speech, Lord Campbell asked that the *Miller vs. Salomons* case be dealt with as soon as possible.[275] The Lord Chancellor responded that it was a matter for the interested parties whether or not the cause was debated, as up until that point both parties had applied for the cause to be stood over; a further joint application was made that the case might stand over for another two months, which was why another postponement had been granted, from June 15th to August 15th, which would take the matter into the next session.

Progress on the issue remained more or less stalled and was probably declared over once the Jews achieved their 1858 victory.

We shall remember that the sensational verdict of the lower court was published on April 19th, 1852. With that verdict, until its annulment, Salomons' entire existence remained endangered, which is why the Jewish camp decided to take the appropriate rescue measures.

The use of the legal system served perfectly to change this state of affairs.

Already by the 4th of May, that is, only two weeks later, Lord Lyndhurst introduced a bill [the Disabilities Repeal Bill] to annul the law which had allowed Salomons to be convicted, by way of substituting it with a new one which would only involve financial penalties for such contraventions, without further disadvantages for the man so convicted.[276]

Lord Lyndhurst was warmly supported by Lord Campbell, who branded the severity of the punishment of the old law as 'a disgrace to the age in which we lived; they were the remnants of the barbarous prejudices of former times'.[277]

At this time, a Conservative government headed by the Earl of Derby was in power. It seems like an irony of fate that it was this very man, who until then had always been anti-Jewish, who supported the bill as leader of the government. This support was not lessened in any way by the objection of having had to consult with the other members of the cabinet.[278] After Lord Campbell had additionally requested that the law be retroactively applied to January 1st, 1851 [in order to indemnify Salomons], the bill was admitted at the first reading.[279] On the 7th and the 17th of May the other two required readings took place in the House of Lords.[280]

The first two readings were approved without debate in the Lower House.[281] The third reading was attempted so late at night that nobody was interested in it any longer. But a member [Mr. Mullings] protested against the bill 'being proceeded with at that late hour', a protest to which Mr. Newdegate added his support. Newdegate made clear that he would vote against the bill, and stated, among other reasons for this decision: 'With respect to any disabilities which had been incurred by Mr. Alderman Salomons, he had incurred them with his eyes open, and well knowing

275 *Hansard*, Volume 147, pp. 108-16.
276 *Hansard*, Volume 121, pp. 190-2.
277 *Hansard*, Volume 121, p. 193. Translator's note: Quoted verbatim from original source.
278 *Hansard*, Volume 121, p. 194.
279 *Hansard*, Volume 121, pp. 198-9.
280 *Hansard*, Volume 121, pp. 354, 733.
281 *Hansard*, Volume 122, pp. 1, 331.

the consequences of his acts.' Due to the lateness of the hour, it was agreed to end the sitting, and the debate was adjourned until June 21st.[282]

When the June 21st sitting began, Mr. Newdegate again protested vehemently against the law that his adversaries were striving to institute. 'He believed that the action brought against Mr. Salomons by Mr. Miller was a collusive action, and if the penalties could be evaded by a collusive action, any one might vote here night after night without punishment.' As his theory of collusion 'had been held by the Lord Chief Baron' himself, Newdegate asked that the progress on the bill be suspended for three months, practically a rejection statement, 'so that the House might have time to inquire into its effect' given the potential for 'the most dangerous consequences'.[283] Mr. Roundell Palmer, another member, pointed out that the bill had been presented by a Conservative. Newdegate understood this as an appeal to his duty as a Conservative member and to his consequent sense of solidarity with his party, and thus consented to withdraw his amendment, but not without expressing his misgivings about the implications of Parliament being able to override the authority of the Court of Exchequer, and most certainly with great repugnance on his part. The bill was then passed into law without difficulty.[284]

As the law could be applied retroactively,[285] the sentence pronounced against Salomons only remain valid in terms of the financial penalty element. We see that what was possible in the days of Sampson Gideon was even more the case a hundred years later. There can be no better proof of the state of servitude to the Jews that was suffered by the classes who in those days governed England.

282 *Hansard*, Volume 122, pp. 697-8. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.
283 *Hansard*, Volume 122, p. 1127. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source. It is also interesting to note that Newdegate claims that the presiding judge also refused to admit the Hansard records as evidence of Salomons' behaviour during the trial.
284 *Hansard*, Volume 122, pp. 1128-9.
285 *Statutes of the United Kingdom*, Volume 92, p. 107.

New Battles

Not only the legislative bodies, but also the completely impartial judiciary had a clear position against Jewish emancipation. And public opinion continued to be equally opposed to the Jewish agenda. It is truly surprising then that, despite everything, yet again the Jews renewed their efforts to attain their goal with the help of their powerful protectors. New attacks were soon to start. Meanwhile, Lord Derby's cabinet had been substituted by Lord Aberdeen's, in which Lord Russell acted as Foreign Secretary; it was in this capacity, in February 1853, that Russell presented a motion to Parliament which proposed: 'That this House do resolve itself into a Committee to take into consideration certain Civil Disabilities affecting the Jews.'[286]

Sir Robert Inglis[287] pointed out once more that the Jews were and would always continue to be a separate nation. For this reason they could not be granted, under any circumstance, admission to Parliament. Sir Robert Peel[288] expressed surprise that so much noise was being made over thirty thousand Jews among thirty million Christians. Although the defenders of the Jews were apt to lavish all of the highest praise upon this group, it was important that the negative aspects of the Jewish presence were not forgotten:

> It was not solely upon religious grounds that he opposed the introduction of the Jews into the House, but because he had considered that those words, 'On the true faith of a Christian,' represented a great principle; and, denying, as the Jews did, the fundamental principles of Christianity, it was incompatible and inconsistent with the dignity and character of the Christian Parliament to admit them to the exercise of the highest functions of the State. This measure was unwise and unnecessary, and, consequently, impolitic. It was idle to say we need be under no apprehension of their swamping our institutions, or filling all of the high offices of State. He did not believe any other constituency besides the City of London could be found confiding its political interests to a Hebrew legislator; but really we had seen of late such remarkable changes and contradictions, that it was almost impossible to argue what consequences might result from either men or measures, and he could not consent to run the risk of the possibility of that which might occur, and of the interests of the Church of England being submitted to the legislation of the Jews. What was the character, and respectability, and moral influence of the Jewish community in England? Their numbers were not above 30,000 – 30,000 among 30,000,000; but it would not matter one straw if there were 30 or 30,000, provided the principle was good, and there was a necessity for Parliament to interfere. Their charitable disposition and general good conduct he was perfectly ready to admit were worthy of our consideration; but he did not think that there was a title to all the great encomiums that some were in the habit of passing upon them in that House when such measures as the present were being considered. He would merely refer the House to what passed before the Select Committee on Juvenile Offenders. There it appeared in evidence that the chief instigators of crime in the metropolis were Jews.

286 *Hansard*, Volume 124, p. 604. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
287 *Hansard*, Volume 124, p. 604.
288 *Hansard*, Volume 124, p. 610. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. I have also included elements of the speech where were elided in Aldag's text, for their interest to the modern reader.

This was literally what appeared in evidence, and the statement was justified on the ground that the Jews almost exclusively afforded facilities for the disposal of stolen goods. He maintained, that if this was the case in the metropolis, it must be so in all the great centres of population – in Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Birmingham – and therefore the Jews were not, as a body, entitled to those high encomiums which were generally passed upon them. The House, however, must consider that they were now merely considering a personal affair of the noble Lord the Member for the City of London. That noble Lord had the honour of representing the City of London with a Jew, and he had given a pledge that he would annually bring forward in this House a measure upon the subject of the Jews' disabilities. Now, Baron Rothschild was probably a very worthy man – they all knew he was a very *wealthy* man – but he (Sir. R. Peel) did not think he was entitled to a seat in that House on account of his wealth, for everybody was perfectly aware how that wealth had been amassed. It was only last night he had read in a newspaper which was very well informed upon foreign subjects, that the House of Rothschild had consented to grant a loan to the Government of Athens, with very considerable guarantees, at the rate of 9 per cent; and they could consequently very well understand how the Rothschild family had amassed their wealth. He was ready to admit that Baron Rothschild might be a very worthy man; but, at the same time, as much had been said by the President of the Board of Control (Sir C. Wood) about gagging the French and Belgian press, no one had done more to gag the expression of liberal opinions throughout the world than the House of Rothschild, from the loans contracted with despotic Governments, like, for instance, that of Naples. But, even supposing Baron Rothschild to be a very worthy man, he, for one, had expected, considering the qualities of the noble Lord who represented the Government in that House, and that the Government represented all the political factions that had combined to oppose the late Government, that the country would have received at his hands some measures more practical and more important for the material interest of the people of this country. In 1851 and 1852 they had been distinctly told by the noble Lord of the absolute necessity that existed for a new Reform Bill; and yet now that the noble found himself leader in the House of Commons for a coalition Cabinet, that measure was almost indefinitely adjourned. At Carlisle, at Southwark, and in the City of London, we had heard of nothing else but allusions to the gross bribery, corruption, and intimidation which had prevailed over the country at the last election… however, the noble Lord had thought proper to adjourn weightier considerations of Government for the purpose of hurriedly introducing a Jew Bill…

…he for one, upon conscientious convictions, believing that he was best fulfilling the wishes of those whose opinions he was to a certain extent bound to consider, believing also that in so doing he was giving a fair interpretation to the views of the people of this country, he gave to this Bill his most determined resistance…[289]

289 [Aldag's note] There is a delicate irony in the original English which results from the wordplay of 'worthy' and 'wealthy'. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source, although I have italicised the word 'wealthy' in the text at the juncture of which Aldag remarks, as it would doubtless have been stressed by Peel as he spoke, to underscore the pun.

After the debate the division took place, which resulted in a narrow majority, of 234 votes to 205, in favour of the bill.

Then a committee was named which was tasked with establishing the wording of the law. On March 1st, 1853, the first reading took place, followed by the second reading on May 11th.[290] Once again passionate arguments took places between the two camps. The anti-Jews were primarily represented by the members Sir Frederic Thesiger[291] and Mr. Charles Newdegate [see footnote].[292] The first went back to pointing out that the Jews, as a separate nation, could not be granted any seat in the Parliament, while the second emphasised that even in Cromwell's time the Jews had made improper demands. The honourable member Mr. Drummond was reported as declaring that:

> They [the Jews] were looking forward to the time when they should trample upon the Gentiles like ashes under the soles of their feet. They cared very little about principle, but a great deal about interest.
>
> […]
>
> He had been struck by a passage he read not long ago, in which it was said that the time was when the nations of the earth were bound together in unity with Rome for their universal centre, while the talisman which bound them was *credo*. True we were still bound together, but our centre was the Stock Exchange, and the talisman which governed us was not *credo*, but *credit*. It is not *credo* – no-one says *I* believe in anything; but *credit*: he believes someone else.[293] The Bill before this House originated in these circumstances: The rabble of London, partly out of the love of mischief, partly from contempt of the House of Commons, and partly from a desire to give a slap in the face of Christianity, elected a Jew.

He also declared that, if it were believed that Jews could be admitted to Parliament in such circumstances, then Parliament should do so, but that he, 'with a safe conscience, could not and would not'.[294]

The honourable member Mr. Herbert, who spoke in defence of the bill, reproached the anti-Jewish faction for their argument that the Hebrews were a separate nation with negative qualities:

> You exclude him, you say, on account of his nationality, his origin, and his race; but if that be true, and if you say there is an inherent nationality about the Jew – about his race and about his origin – why do you not exclude a converted Jew? His race, his

290 *Hansard*, Volume 125, pp. 71-118, 166-72, 1217-1290.

291 *Hansard*, Volume 125, p. 79.

292 *Hansard*, Volume 125, p. 87. Translator's note: The original text states gives 'Mr. Bernal Osborne' as the second anti-Jewish MP. This is clearly an error on Aldag's part, as Ralph Bernal Osborne (the Osborne surname being taken from his wife on marriage) was of Sephardic Jewish descent and argued consistently in Parliament for Jewish emancipation, including in the debate indicated here. Given that Charles Newdegate also took part in this debate, one must assume that this was the name Aldag intended.

293 Translator's note: In the original text Aldag added an extra footnote to reproduce this wordplay in English, because 'the delicacy of the English text cannot be fully reflected in translation'.

294 *Hansard*, Volume 125, pp. 94-96. Translator's note: The full extract from Drummond's speech has been reproduced verbatim from the Hansard, although the 'I' has been italicised here to aid comprehension, as this would have undoubtedly have been stressed during the speech.

> origin, and his blood are the same; and on what principle did you allow a converted Jew to sit in Parliament for several years?[295]

This last statement is very interesting because, in accordance with our current views, what is effectively exposed here is an internal contradiction within the anti-Jewish argument.

The debate lasted for two days and two nights. In the division after the second reading, the philo-Semites emerged victorious with a majority of 41 votes. As before, for the third reading the government took refuge in a typically parliamentarian manoeuvre to get the bill passed quickly and smoothly. Just before Easter, deliberations about a bill which was part of the order of business were suddenly interrupted and, out of the blue, the Jewish bill was unexpectedly put before Parliament. Most of the members were already enjoying the Easter holidays, but the few members who remained protested almost unanimously against such a tactic. The particularly strong protest from the member Mr. George Henry Vansittart obliged the government to abort their plans for a third reading that day.[296] The same thing took place on April 15th, 1853.[297] Once again there were heated debates. The member Mr. Charles Cumming-Bruce made clear that 'if the Duke of Wellington was alive, the government would not have dared to act as they had done in the matter'.[298]

During the course of the debate, a very interesting speech was made regarding events that had taken place in Palestine. It came from the member Mr. William Kirk, who spoke in favour of the Jews:

> It was now a period of 3,774 years since it pleased God to choose that people as a peculiar race, and in selecting Abraham as their great progenitor he used these remarkable words, 'I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'
>
> […]
>
> The Jewish people resident in this country seemed to be most anxious to have representatives of their own race in the House of Commons. Might not that desire be an indication of the coming fulfilment of the prophecy as to their restoration? Might it not be in the designs of Providence that the leaders of the Jews in this country should obtain seats in our House of Parliament, in order that they might become thoroughly acquainted with our mode of legislation, and subsequently legislate for the Jews in their own country after the English model? This House being, as it were, a sort of normal school for their instruction, would not the admission of Jews to our Legislature induce the Jews, when restored to their own land, to become the firmest friends of Great Britain? And the friendship of such a people, when restored, and in possession not simply of Palestine, as they had in the days of David, and Solomon, but of all that was originally promised to them, of the whole of the land extending from the Euphrates to the Nile, and from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean, would be of no little advantage to the people of these realms. That land which would come into the

295 *Hansard*, Volume 125, p. 102. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
296 *Hansard*, Volume 125, p. 167 ff.
297 *Hansard*, Volume 125, pp. 1217-1290.
298 *Hansard*, Volume 125, p. 1220. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

> possession of the Jews would be the most fertile and the most desirable in the world. It would form part of the highway from Great Britain to Indian and Australian Colonies. The Jews, in possession of their own land, would undoubtedly become one of the most important nations upon the earth. That was prophesied of them. Upon every ground, therefore, both of justice and of public policy, he called upon the House to vote in favour of the third reading of the Bill.[299]

It is interesting to say the least that already in 1853 an English member of Parliament had declared himself in support Palestine being given, along with the concession of large swathes of adjacent territories, to the Jews.

At the end of the debate, Sir Robert Peel spoke once more about the problem as a whole:

> It so happened that at this moment there were two countries in Europe, one where restrictions were being enforced against the Jews, and another where complete emancipation had been effected. If he might be allowed, he would take one first, and then the other. Intelligence had just been received that the Emperor of Russia had published a ukase prohibiting Jews from representing Christian trading and commercial houses in that country; and he did not think the conduct of the Emperor Nicholas was much to be blamed. But suppose it was; let the House just look at home awhile. Here we saw the most extensive trading and commercial community in the world confiding a portion of its political rights to a wealthy citizen of the Jewish race, a kind of Goliath of Gath. He knew perfectly well that the City of London might return for its representative, constitutionally speaking, whomsoever it pleased. Hon. Members, perhaps, might recollect that in the time of George II. and George III. the borough of Sudbury was commonly advertised for sale to the highest bidder. What the Marquess of Broadacres did there, was there any reason why the Wiseacres of Portsoken should not do in the City? Still, they would never be able to persuade him that the trade, commerce, and influence of the City of London were, or could be, judiciously entrusted to this Mr. de Rothschild. He doubted very much if they would be able to persuade the people of England that the influence of the representatives of the City of London, which had so long been the stronghold of freedom and liberty, ought to be entrusted to an Austrian Consul General – to the wealthy representative of a moneyed family, which had certainly done more than any other family in the world to gag and stifle liberty. He was one of those who thought that the City of London ought to be represented either by some great political character, or by some of the merchant princes of the empire. As far as regarded great political character, he did not think the City could have made a more judicious selection than the noble Lord opposite, for he stood high in the opinion of his fellow-countrymen as an enlightened statesman; but he did not hesitate to say that the selection of Mr. de Rothschild as the representative of the commercial influence of the City of London was, to his mind, the greatest possible slur upon the character and respectability of the City. (*Cries of* ‘Oh, oh!’) He said, ‘to his mind’ and he repeated it. (*A laugh*.) Yes, to his mind it was a great slur upon the character and respectability of the trade and commerce of the City of London to have made such a selection.

299 *Hansard*, Volume 125, p. 1226 ff. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.

> He would now take the other case to which he had referred, where complete emancipation had been voted to the Jews. It had happened that in the States of the Prince of Meiningen the representatives had voted complete emancipation to the Jews; and what had been the effect? Why, that the sovereign prince had been inundated with petitions from his subjects, those petitions begging him to resist what their representatives had passed. He did not know whether the House would care for what took place there; but what, he would ask, was the case with the petitions in this country? He found that there had been 35,000 signatures attached to the petitions against the measure presented to that House since the second reading of this Bill. Those petitions, he contended, were entitled to great respect; but how many were the petitions on the other side? Very few indeed. But in considering the merits of the case, he would just take one petition in favour of the Jews, and one against; he would take the petition from the Corporation of the City of London for, and that from the University of Oxford against; he would take that for, which – as the *Times* newspaper, that recognised organ of public opinion, said – came from 'the scandal and the nuisance of the metropolis'; and the other against, from the most learned and enlightened community in the empire.[300]

Despite the best efforts of the anti-Jewish faction, the bill was approved with a majority of 288 votes to 230.

The bill passed by Parliament was sent, as usual, to the House of Lords, and the philo-Semites could this time harbour hopes of also gaining a majority in the Upper House. The then Prime Minister, the Earl of Aberdeen, had voted in previous years as a member of the House of Lords against the Jewish bills that were presented at the time. As he was the one who sent the bill to the House of Lords, it was trusted that his personal supporters would follow his example and vote in favour of the bill, which would have been sufficient to achieve, finally, its approval. But yet more the people who believed this were deluding themselves: after long debates, the House of Lords again defeated the bill, on this occasion with 164 votes to 115.[301]

It is also instructive to look at the attitudes of the press from both sides regarding this attempt. The *Times* maintained the belief, almost inconceivable, that 'the religious antecedents of the Jews constitute the only real objection to the privileges now claimed for them'.[302] Seemingly, the *Times* had not found out about Newdegate's speeches, which, as is known, did not limit themselves in any way to such reasons. Only on one occasion did the *Times* deal with the assertion from the opposing camp that the Jews were international.[303] From what can be observed, it was considered a highly inaccurate and inappropriate argument to use when the question was being discussed.

The *Morning Post* was angered that the Jewish Question was brought up relentlessly in Parliament. The only reason for it was that Rothschild wanted to enter Parliament, whatever the cost, and the government was supporting him in his ambitions.

---

300 *Hansard*, Volume 125, p. 1273. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
301 *Hansard*, Volume 126, pp. 754-796.
302 *Times*, 26/2/1853, 14/3/1853, 18/4/1853. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from the 26/2/1853 issue.
303 *Times*, 18/4/1853.

> If a small man like Mr. Moses, the vendor of new clothes, or Mr. Isaacs, the vendor of old ones, had demanded a seat in Parliament upon his own simple right as an English citizen, would the Leader of the House of Commons have moved heaven and earth to get him in? We think not. The little Jew would have been met by a reminder of the unit's place he occupied among the millions of his Christian fellow-citizens. But because the Crœsus of the day, the convenient agent of continental Governments, the negotiator of enormous State loans, the refuge of exhausted Exchequers, and the key-holder of half the coffers of Europe, is ambitious of a seat in Parliament, therefore the first principles of our legislation are to be invaded and set at nought for his special benefit…[304]

The *Standard* showed its disgust in a similar way. It accused Lord Russell of having shady dealings with Rothschild, who contributed to the Russell's election costs and had the Jewish electors give Russell their votes in exchange for Russell, as his part of the 'vile bargain', presenting one bill after another which furthered the Jewish agenda.[305] These accusations must have had some basis in truth, as no legal action was taken against the *Standard* for libel or any similar charge.

It was not only the press that considered Jewish ambitions to be completely inappropriate; by means of petitions the vast majority of the population also showed their aversion. For example, in the debates on the latest bill, which took place in March, many petitions from individuals and whole districts were read out, against which there were none in favour of the Jews.[306] The month of April brought even better proof: compared with the countless large petitions presented by individuals, towns, cities and communities, only a very few were found in favour of the Jews.[307] July showed the fullest evidence of this prevailing mood, with 1,055 petitions containing 34,525 signatures against the Jews, and only seven petitions containing 450 signatures in their favour.[308] As can be seen, the people still wanted the Jews to remain excluded from the legislative bodies.

This anti-Jewish stance of the people was certainly due to the great Germanophile Thomas Carlyle taking up the pen to attack the Jews.

Once more the opposing camp fought for their agenda with new pro-Jewish propaganda leaflets, some of which came from the pen of well-known Nonconformist minister John Stoughton, which demonstrates yet again how in every epoch numerous servants of the Church were willing to actively intervene in favour of the Jews. This British shepherd of souls opined that the world owed a lot to the Jews for their qualities and their success in the sciences and the arts, all the more so for their ill treatment in the past. According to him, it was inconceivable that these 'benefactors of the human race' were persecuted and treated like dogs in England, since, according to all indications, 'the Jews were after all to be the final saviours of the world'. It will be no surprise, then, that Stoughton came to the conclusion that the Jews could not be let into Parliament too soon.[309]

---

304 *Morning Post*, 16/3/1853. Translator's note: Excerpt reproduced verbatim from original source.
305 *Standard*, 21/2/1853, 25/2/1853. Translator's note: The phrase 'vile bargain' is found in both issues.
306 *Times*, 9/3/1853, 10/3/1853.
307 *Times*, 15/4/1853, 30/4/1853.
308 *Standard*, 26/7/1853.
309 Stoughton: pp. 9-12, 22-25, 27-30. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source (pp. 27, 28).

A year later, February 6th, 1854, Lord John Russell returned to presenting another bill in Parliament. This time he changed tactic, because it was not a bill for the general elimination of Jewish disabilities, but only a bill for modifying the Oath of Abjuration. The bill was titled 'Parliamentary Oaths Bill' and aimed for the three aforementioned oaths to be replaced by one integrated oath. In addition, the oath designed for Catholics would thus would be annulled by a special law, so that a common oath for all British citizens could be implemented.

It would appear that there were two reasons for pursuing this variation: Firstly, it was likely that they did not wish to openly signal to the public that the Jews could gain entry to Parliament in the case of this law being passed; secondly, it was desired to win over the Catholic members, because with their support the chance of success seemed more certain.

The first reading took place without a debate and, moreover, without a vote worthy of mention.[310] At the second reading Sir Frederic Thesiger returned to being very active, acting as an attack dog in the debate. He continually warned the Chamber that it was solely the Jews that were yet again behind this bill and that it must not let itself be fooled by the fact that the Catholics were also mentioned in the text. He was scathing of Russell's connivance with Rothschild, which had led to his continual failed attempts to push through the Jewish agenda, and warns those present:

> …inflamed, rather than discouraged, by successful opposition, he [Russell] now proposes to break down some of the defences of our Protestant Constitution, in order that he may be able to march over their ruins with the Jew [Rothschild] by his side, and seat him in the Legislature.[311]

In Thesiger's judgement, the proposed new oath did not offer sufficient security to the Protestant government of England due to the modification of the Catholic oath; it had not to be forgotten that it had been not long since the Pope had shown aggressive ambition for all Catholics, which was not in consonance with the national and Protestant interests of England.

In the course of the debate the Opposition received support from an unexpected source. Disraeli suddenly spoke against Lord John Russell to some of the previous defenders of the lifting of Jewish disabilities. He declared that in view of the cited ambitions of the Pope, he could not give his approval to the bill – as far as it concerned the Catholics. But as the bill came as a whole, and could not therefore be separated, he greatly regretted not being able to vote in its favour.

In addition, he did not consider it proper that nowhere in the bill did the word 'Jew' appear, as it would not be clear to the broad masses that with the passage of this bill, the Jews would finally achieve their much-deserved equal rights. The Jews had a right to a full and complete emancipation, visible to the eyes of the whole world, which was not observable in Lord John Russell's bill. Otherwise, the Jews could wait tranquilly for their eventual full and complete emancipation, as the Almighty Being, who had never deserted them, would lend them his support.[312]

---

310 *Hansard*, Volume 130, pp. 272-282.

311 *Hansard*, Volume 133, p. 870 ff. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. Note that in this speech Thesiger also reveals that the Parliament had received, as of the previous day, 481 public petitions against the bill, which in total contained no fewer than 60,171 signatures.

312 *Hansard*, Volume 133, p. 963 ff.

It is very likely that Disraeli's behaviour brought many hitherto supporters of Lord John Russell to the side of the opposition. Thus the supporters of Jewish emancipation had to watch as the bill did not even pass the House of Commons, but was defeated, albeit with the slimmest majority, by 251 votes to 247.[313]

The Jewish press, moved by the latest failure, attributed the defeat exclusively to the fact that on this occasion the enemies of the Jews and the enemies of the papists had marched together to win the battle.[314] When the bill appeared, the *Times* did not step back from their position, not even before the proposition that, in the case of the bill being defeated by the House of Lords, it could trigger a dissolution of Parliament and the naming of a hundred new Peers, favourable to the Jews, to thus gain an absolute majority of philo-Semitic lords in the Upper House. The *Times* was recommending, therefore, a revolutionary new act of legislation, almost never before seen, which would have necessarily transformed the nation's political life at the most profound level. And all that for some thirty thousand Jews in a population of thirty million!

Lord John Russell had undoubtedly committed a tactical error on presenting the bill to Parliament in the way he had authored it, shortly after the publication of the Pope's aspirations. In any case, it would surely have been preferable to modify or abandon the bill after finding out Disraeli's position on it. It is also likely that the incredible events surrounding Salomons' intrusion into Parliament were still fresh in the collective memory of the English public, due to which the former lost his sympathetic aura of 'poor, unfairly persecuted Jew': this was a far from insignificant factor because it is known that, almost instinctively, the English nation always sides with the underdog, whether this be justified or not.

313 *Hansard*, Volume 133, pp. 971-4.
314 *Times*, 25/5/1854, 26/5/1854.

Progress and Resistance

Recent events in the fight for emancipation had taken a very unhappy turn for the Jews, despite the support lent by powerful sponsors. Furthermore, public opinion was more set against them than it had ever been. For this reason it must have been clearly observed that the Jewish movement needed to take a break to get over the latest failures, because, in contrast to the previous standard practice in such situations, no action was undertaken in Parliament in the remainder of that year, nor in the year after that. Nevertheless, the Jews did win some partial victories to add to their tally.

The universities had been barred to Jews for a long time. Various laws promulgated during the reigns of Elizabeth,[315] James I[316] and George I[317] had prohibited their admission. Oxford University was the first to take an interest in the Jewish Question regarding admission. In 1854, the Oxford University Reform Act was passed, which decreed that: 'It shall not be necessary for any person, upon matriculating in the University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration or to take any oath, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding.'[318] This made the entry of Jews into Oxford possible. This example was followed in 1856 by the University of Cambridge.[319] The remaining universities did not delay in adopting this measure.

But it was only in 1871, with the Universities Tests Act, that a unitary regulation was finally brought in.[320] Of course, it was through this law that the Jews were also granted full freedom of education.

The practice of the profession of educator or teacher had been just as prohibited to Jews for a long time. Here also the main obstacle was constituted by the swearing of the oath. In addition, there existed another law, the so-called Act of Uniformity, which dated back to 1662.[321] This act, among other requirements, demanded that every professor, tutor and schoolteacher had to sign a declaration in which he gave his conformity to the Liturgy of Church of England, as it was by law established. In accordance with this law, all teachers and tutors for private homes had to obtain a licence from the bishop of their diocese to be able to practice their profession. Any contravention of this law was punishable with imprisonment for up to three months.[322] As would be expected, only the members of the Anglican church, and not the Jews, received such a licence. This situation was only modified in 1846[323] with the aforementioned Religious Disabilities Act, which authorised the Jews to be private tutors. The final restrictions on the ability to teach were eliminated in 1871 with the Universities Tests Act.

The strength of the City of London's support for Jewish interests can be seen in the election of September 30th, 1855, which elevated Salomons to the office of Lord Mayor. Only someone familiar with English society can comprehend the high honour and at the same time the power that

315 1 Eliz. c. 1.
316 7 Jac. I. c. 6.
317 1 Geo s. 2. c. 13.
318 17 and 18 Victoria c. 81. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source: (https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/17-18/81).
319 19 and 20 Victoria c. 88.
320 34 and 35 Victoria c. 26.
321 13 and 14 Car. II c. 4. Translator's note: For details on how the 1558 Act of Uniformity affected the Jews, see Volume 2 of this study.
322 Henriques: p. 130.
323 9 and 10 Victoria c. 59

the Jews had thus achieved. Nevertheless, their joy at this success was somewhat lost in the prevailing euphoria over the capture of Sevastopol.[324]

On November 9th, 1855, David Salomons was invested into his new office with all pomp and ceremony. A huge banquet at the town hall was thrown in his honour, and it was attended by Queen Victoria's husband, Prince Albert. One of the highest dignitaries of the Church, who was also present at the banquet, became so enthused by the grandness of the occasion, that he addressed the royal guest with the following words: 'Thanks be to God, Your Royal Highness, we have found, at last, a true gentleman for the post of Lord Mayor.' 'Yes, my lord,' answered the prince, 'but we have had to seek him outside of Christian circles.'[325]

Salomons had, in the 19th-century alone, three Jewish successors to his post: Sir Benjamin Samuel Phillips (1865-1866), Sir Henry Isaac (1889-1890) and Sir George Faudel Phillips (1897-1898).[326]

This new success, as well as the collapse of Lord Aberdeen's coalition government, inspired the Jews and their allies to resume the attack.

The new government was formed by Lord Palmerston, who looked benevolently upon Jewish emancipation, but, to general surprise, neither did this government initially show the slightest inclination to make a spontaneous intervention in Parliament in favour of the Jews. It is not known if it was the government or the Jewish camp who compelled MP Milner Gibson to present a new bill of this type to Parliament on February 22nd. What *is* known is that this member introduced a private member's bill for the annulment of the Oath of Abjuration, in the first week of the Parliamentary session.[327]

This bill, like the one before it, avoided all mention of Jewish disabilities. In addition, it was skilfully based on the assertion that the Oath of Abjuration was antiquated and in need of annulment, which was even the opinion of the anti-Jewish faction.

As has previously been stated, this oath demanded that the subjects of the English monarch abjure all loyalty to the Pretender (the last of the Stuarts) and to his descendants. But as there was no longer any Stuart descendancy, there was no longer, in reality, any need for the oath to be taken.

The close cooperation between the government and the bill's sponsor is proven by the fact that the government immediately began deliberations on the bill, to which they lent their full support. Lord Palmerston and – as always – Lord Russell, were the spokesmen for the philo-Semites. To the already cited reasons in favour of the bill, they added that in the epoch in which the oath was instituted, there were hardly any Jews in England, which meant that the legislator's intention could not have concerned Jews when the measure was taken. In any case, the general situation was such that the oath would have to be annulled, being an obstacle to the achievement of equitable rights for Jews.

Once more the battle began in its accustomed format: debates that lasted entire days with all types of reasoning employed by both sides, and at the second reading in Parliament the Jews

---

324 *Morning Chronicle*, 1/10/1855.

325 *Morning Chronicle*, 10/11/1855. Translator's note: As a point of interest, the newspaper was keen to remind readers that 'the present Lord Mayor is the first of his race who has held the office'. I was, however, unable to locate the original form of the quotation in the text above.

326 Wolf: *Essays.…*, pp. 328-29.

327 *Hansard*, Volume 140, p.1288.

triumphed, with 230 votes to 195.[328] The spokesman of the adversaries, Sir Frederic Thesiger, tried once more to impede a second reading, but his motion was defeated, by 159 votes to 110.[329]

It almost goes without saying that the House of Lords once more rejected the bill, by 110 votes to 78.[330]

The impotent rage of the Jews and their allies was aimed mainly at Lord Derby, under whose direction the House of Lords had repelled this attack.[331] The gazette of the Rothschild court almost surpassed itself with its insults, as can be seen from the opening of one of its articles:

> With a solemn gravity which rendered the hypocrisy of his proceeding only the more offensive, Lord Derby last night introduced in the House of Lords his Bill for 'the amendment' of the Oath of Abjuration… Those who regard this movement from a larger and more liberal point of view, only see in this new Bill a poor and petty attempt to offer an insult to the representative branch of the Legislature, quite unworthy of any man aspiring to the position of statesman…[332]

Note also how, on this occasion, disillusionment transforms into new threats against the Jews' adversaries.

The fact that the government found itself in great financial straits after the Crimean War and that Rothschild had taken it upon himself, as so many times before, to arrange a loan of some five millions pounds to cover the debts,[333] must have played no small part in the government's involvement in the bill.

One could be forgiven for thinking that the Jews had become disheartened. It is particularly surprising that there were always governments ready to support Jewish emancipation bills and yet the Jews came away with one defeat after another.

In the spring of the following year – 1857 – new parliamentary elections were held. It seemed that finally the moment had arrived for the definitive victory after all of the Jewish efforts. Lord Palmerston not only found his old majority back in Parliament once more, but also that his party had gained many more seats. In addition, Rothschild had again been elected as an MP for the City of London. Initially, great fears had been harboured for his chances of victory, because the elections had been arranged for Saturday, March 28th, and it was feared that the Jews, a very religious people, would not go near the ballot boxes. But Rothschild could not give up on their support. During the morning hours their participation was very weak, but when the synagogues emptied out

---

328 *Hansard*, Volume 141, pp. 703-759.
329 *Hansard*, Volume 142, pp. 595-605, 1165-1197.
330 *Hansard*, Volume 142, pp. 1772-1895.
331 *Times*, 23/6/1856, 24/6/1856.
332 *Morning Chronicle*, 25/6/1856. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. We can see from this excerpt that Lord Derby looked to counter the attack by seeking to amend the original bill rather than rejecting it outright. Such an amendment would no doubt ensure that the oath retained its Christian component, while removing the part about abjuring the Stuart ascendancy, the ostensible reason for the bill's introduction. This would leave the pro-Jewish faction with no official cause for complaint, which is doubtless the reason for the journalist's sophistic attempt to sway his readers emotionally, because, knowing that his faction is being outmanoeuvred, his only recourse is to attempt to shame or belittle Derby for his actions.
333 Paul: Volume II, p. 56; Reeves: p. 248.

they were seen voting in large number, because the rabbis had given the interpretation that the exercise of a public right was not incompatible with the God-given commandments.

To everyone's surprise, this time Rothschild managed to win even more votes than Lord Russell, for which the joy, as well as the joy at both being re-elected, naturally overflowed in Jewish circles.[334]

Already within six weeks of the elections being held and immediately after the new Parliament was opened, the Jewish Question was yet again on the House of Commons table. This time it was the Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston himself, who felt sufficiently powerful to undertake the fight, perhaps confident in his evident success at the election and in his large majority in the House of Commons. His bill set out for the three different oaths to be replaced by one alone. He had made the issue so much his own that he even apologised to Parliament for having taken up the matter himself instead of entrusting it to Lord Russell. He observed that the passing of the bill would make it possible for Jews to occupy seats in Parliament, but that the special 1829 oath for Catholics would not undergo any change whatsoever. He had learned, then, from previous years: the Catholic Question would remain intact. The new oath proposed by Lord Palmerston planned to exclude those contentious final words that had been fought over so intensely for so many years.

Sir Frederic Thesiger first gave a thorough historical summary of the battle that had taken place up until that point. He considered a synopsis necessary, because many of the new MPs would likely be unfamiliar with the various phases of the battle. He limited himself to this exposition, having evidently decided to save his arguments against the opposition for a more opportune juncture. For this reason, the first reading took place almost without any resistance whatsoever.[335]

At the second reading, there were also no opposition speeches. Sir Frederic Thesiger only made a statement to the effect that the anti-Jewish faction would give the bill their approval if it were to be amended so that the oath included the phrase: 'And I do make this promise, renunciation, and declaration, heartily, willingly, and truly, on the true faith of a Christian.' The philo-Semites wholeheartedly opposed this amendment, because the amendment would ensure that Jewish access to Parliament remained blocked. The subsequent debate lacked nothing of the aggression and duration that had characterised the previous ideological clashes. But the situation soon turned against the Opposition when a leading Conservative, Sir John Pakington, who up until that point had always been on the anti-Jewish side, declared that he was against Thesiger's motion for an amendment:

> …I must say, that I deeply regret the manner in which Her Majesty's Government have brought this subject before the House. I think it desirable to retain the words 'on the true faith of a Christian' for those who do not object to them. They give additional solemnity to an oath to which it is most desirable to impart as much solemnity as possible. I am sorry that the Government have decided to change the shape of the oath in that respect, and I think they would have adopted a far wiser course if they had allowed Christians to take the oath and to conclude it with that solemn form of words to which we have been so long accustomed, and had proceeded to effect the emancipation of the Jews by a Bill similar in principle to that by which the Roman Catholics were formerly emancipated… As, however, the Government have decided upon proceeding

334 *Times*, 28/3/1857, 30/3/1857.
335 *Hansard*, Volume 145, pp. 318-38.

> in this way, and as I have made up my mind that I can no longer conscientiously continue to oppose the admission of the Jews, it only remains for me – and I do it with regret – to support that form of proceeding upon which the Government have decided.[336]

As a consequence, the Conservative Party began to show uncertainty and disunity over the Jewish Question, which had to lead to victory for the Hebrews.

Sir Frederic Thesiger's motion for an amendment was rejected by 341 votes to 201: such a crushing defeat for the anti-Jewish faction had not been seen in years. There was no doubt, therefore, that the third reading would result in a favourable outcome for Jewish emancipation, which is what effectively happened.[337]

Everything yet again came to depend on the position of the House of Lords, in which a majority was finally expected, given that the anti-Jewish faction had been so roundly defeated in the Commons. In addition, the government had given their full support to the bill being passed. Lord Derby, the leader of the Conservative opposition in the House of Lords, asked for the debate over the bill approved in Parliament to be adjourned for six months, a motion that, were it to be accepted, would amount to a refutation of the bill. In an explanation of the reasoning which obliged him to present his motion, Lord Derby said the following:

> I am not going to say a single word to disparage the Jews either in this or any other country. I admit the undoubtedly high antiquity of their nation. I admit that they have been, and may in some future time again be, the most favoured of all the nations of the world. I admit that, in point of eminent abilities, of natural qualifications, and of talents of various descriptions, they stand as high as any nation in the world; but I am not prepared to deny to them that which I am sure they themselves would be the last to abjure – namely, their nationality, and their character as a nation. Although they are scattered by Divine decree over the whole face of the earth, they retain unbroken the chain of their nationality, and they do look forward to that period when, as a nation, they shall have restored to them their national rights and their national territory… My Lords, the Jews were in Egypt, they are in England, and in every other country to which the decrees of Divine Providence have driven them, a nation within a nation. No doubt, they submit to the laws, and discharge the duties of citizens. In this country they are entrusted to the highest possible degree with the carrying out of the laws, with functions of trust, and with the administration of justice. That which alone is withheld from them is a voice in making the laws, and that is withheld because those laws are to regulate a Christian community. My Lords, I say that the Jews do look forward to a period when another and a greater exodus shall collect them from all the countries of the World over which they are dispersed, and shall bring them back into their own country, and to the enjoyment of their own privileges. They retain their laws; they retain their peculiar customs. Though among us, they are not of us. They do not generally associate freely with their fellow-subjects; they have interests wholly apart.

336 *Hansard*, Volume 145, pp. 1817-1823. Translator's note: Both speech excerpts reproduced verbatim from original source.

337 *Hansard*, Volume 145, pp. 1101, 1341, 1759-1868; Volume 146, pp. 143-148, 347-365.

> Between them and us there is an impassable gulf; their most important interests, their highest principles, their greatest views are altogether alien and foreign from ours. It may truly be said of them as was said by a noble and learned Friend behind me (against whom the expression excited considerable obloquy) of another people, that they are 'aliens in blood, aliens in religion, and aliens in language'.
>
> […]
>
> …it is the undoubted right of every citizen to enjoy by an indefeasible title all the rights and all the privileges – for my noble Friend [the Earl of Granville], I think, added the word 'privileges', and if he did not he ought to have done so – of citizenship. But in saying that the withholding of any of these rights, the depriving them of, or rather not conferring upon them, any of these privileges, is a remnant of persecution, my noble Friend altogether begged the question as to what are the rights and what are the privileges of citizenship. There are undoubtedly rights which are indefeasibly attached to every citizen of a free country. He has undoubtedly a perfect right to claim security for his person, security for his property, and the free enjoyment of the rites of his religion; and from none of these is the Jew in this country in the slightest degree debarred. But he cannot claim as a right – it is conferred upon him as a privilege – the power of legislating for the community at large – which you do not give to every man, but which you confide to certain individuals selected from the community as properly entitled to exercise these privileges. Certain duties, certain obligations, certain restrictions, have at all times been imposed upon the privilege of sitting and voting in Parliament.
>
> […]
>
> Now, I do not think, on the whole, that I should feel comfortable if a Jew were made Chancellor of the Exchequer. He may very possibly have some natural sympathies which would interfere with a due discharge of the duties of his office. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may be a Jew under this Bill, and very possibly will be…

He then goes on to remind Lord Granville, who had argued that the clause 'upon the true faith of a Christian' had been inserted for the Jesuits and had been intended for the Jews, that the reason that the Jews had not been provided for in the original oath was not because they were perceived as permitted to exercise power, but because they had been banished from the kingdom over three centuries before and, at the time the act of the oath was passed, 'they were, and for many years afterwards remained, in that condition of absolute banishment'. He then highlights the fallacy of Granville's argumentation with the following:

> Why, to talk of introducing an Act of Parliament to prevent persons from sitting and voting in Parliament who could not even enter the kingdom, and to say that because words prohibiting them to sit and vote in Parliament were not directly pointed against the persons who could not enter the country, therefore it was not the intention of the Legislature to exclude them, is as much begging the question as if it were to be said that because in the oath of supremacy we declare that no foreign prince or potentate hath any power, ecclesiastical or spiritual, in this kingdom; therefore, because we do not

> introduce the word 'temporal', we admit that foreign potentates have temporal jurisdiction in this country.

The now elderly Lord Lyndhurst spoke at great length in favour of Jewish emancipation, but in the division of July 10th, 1857, the bill was again defeated by 171 votes to 139.[338]

As had happened so many times before, the Jews' efforts had failed. One would be forgiven for thinking that they and their supporters must have lost hope forever, especially in view of the fact that even the most diehard supporters of the Jews had to admit that most of the population continued to support, as ever, the House of Lords' position.[339] But that was far from the case. With a persistence specific to the Jewish race, a new bill replaced the old one. The plan being banked on was to exhaust the anti-Jewish faction so that at some point they would let their guard down. As we know today, this relentless attack is an intrinsic part of Jewish tactics.

Thus it should not surprise us that it was only a week later that the Jewish emancipation issue, so often debated in the House of Lords, was back to being debated in the Commons.[340] The government, led by Lord Palmerston, frankly admitted that it was not inclined to persist with the Jewish cause, given that it had already done enough with the approval of the bill that had just been defeated by the House of Lords.

Meanwhile Rothschild had resigned from his seat in Parliament, but in the by-election that was called as a result of this move, he once more presented his candidature. Once more he was elected. His resignation must therefore have been a tactical move for further measures, to demonstrate in subsequent battles that the indomitable will of the City was that a Jew be admitted to Parliament.[341]

Rothschild had been elected by proclamation in a public assembly, for there was no other candidate running in the election that the *Standard* described as a 'solemn farce'. The body of voters, as always a 'motley assemblage', was 'almost wholly composed of the members of the Jewish fraternity'.[342]

Not only did the press of the Jews' adversaries brand the election a farce, but it was disgusted that time was being wasted on such a trivial matter; with so many varied and important British interests at risk due to the Indian Mutiny, it could not understand why the populace was being inconvenienced with an issue of such little importance.[343]

---

338 *Hansard*, Volume 146, pp. 416, 1209-1278. Translator's note: Derby's speech extracts are reproduced verbatim from the original source. Additional text from the speech are also included for its perceived reader interest.
339 *Hansard*, Volume 147, p. 111.
340 *Hansard*, Volume 146, pp. 1699-1704, 1772-1780.
341 Henriques: p. 285.
342 *Times*, 24/7/1857, 29/7/1857; *Standard*, 29/7/1857. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from the *Standard* of 29/7/1857.
343 *Standard*, 29/7/1857; *Morning Post*, 29/7/1857.

Jews and Lords

Public opinion continued to be very divided with the regards to the course of events.

The *Times* could not have gone any further in its thundering condemnation of the stubbornness of the Lords. It was incomprehensible, the newspaper claimed, that Rothschild, already elected so many times by the City for some ten years, had still not been able to take up his seat in Parliament. The fury of the *Times* was inexplicable, because Rothschild had stood for election in full cognisance of the legal situation and could therefore not complain of the consequences. Undoubtedly, with their old tactic, the Jews would continue to wear down the positions of their adversaries. Relentless attacks were essential and one bill had to follow another, until the haughty lords eventually gave up all resistance. The House of Commons had to find the courage to grant Rothschild his seat, in contravention of the law and the constitution. Then it would be left to the Upper House to react.[344]

But in its article of July 20th the *Times* reflected on the fact that they still saw themselves as very far from the finishing line:

> There is no chance whatever that the Lords will give way… There will always be for the next 20 years a Jewish member legally elected, but incapable of taking his seat, unless the House of Commons proceeds to settle the question on its own authority. Now, necessity knows no law; a grievance and an anomaly are to be removed, and can only be removed by the separate action of the Commons…
>
> [Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.]

This article was practically an exhortation to violate the constitution, at a time when England was battling hard for the continued existence of her Empire and was in the midst of putting down a dangerous rebellion in India which demanded the use of all of her strength.

In the meantime, Britain saw the founding of the *Daily Telegraph*, whose position on the Jewish Question was no different to what can be observed today. In its editorials it raged against the Lords' reactionary position of so many years standing:

> The Tory aristocracy, the Tory hierarchy, have now been exhibited in their real characters; they are the most dangerous and the most seditious classes in the country. The people, the Commons, and the Crown are willing to work together, in order to dedicate a peace-offering of conciliatory legislation to a long-persecuted sect; but a confederacy of earls and prelates, who, like wizards haunting a pagan ruin, forbid the progress of a timely and beneficent measure, and thus perpetuate an exasperating feud among the guardians of the Constitution…[345]

---

344 *Times*, 16/7/1857, 20/7/1857, 24/7/1857, 4/8/1857.

345 *Daily Telegraph*, 11/7/1857, 13/7/1857. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source (13/7/1857 issue).

The anti-Jewish press was joyous at the new victory, explaining the House of Lords decision as the only one possible and continuing to affirm that the Jews were '"wayfarers and sojourners, as their fathers were"… Would conscientious Jews permit Christians to sit in their Sanhedrim and to take part in the framing of Jewish laws and ordinances?'[346]

The *Morning Post* warned, justifiably, that the national effort to put down the rebellion in India was much more important than satisfying the ambition of a millionaire Jew and pitting one House against the other:

> …there are at the present moment other subjects more worthy of the attention of the good citizens of London than the claims of Baron Rothschild and those of his co-religionists of the Jewish nation… We therefore tell the citizens of London that, at a crisis like the present, they may, and ought to, devote themselves to objects more worthy of regard than the re-election of a rich Jew, and the perpetuation of a most unseemly and most unnecessary contest between the two branches of the Legislature.[347]

New battles for that year were not expected, especially given that it was unlikely that Parliament would sit again. But extraordinary circumstances necessitated a new summons at the end of autumn 1857. Nevertheless, Parliament only met in December. It had been envisaged that the only topic under discussion would be the economic crisis and how to deal with it, but in the December 10th sitting Lord John Russell took advantage of the occasion to introduce a new bill in favour of the Jews, which, just as before, proposed the substitution of the three oaths for a single one. The text was analogous to the one which had been passed by the Commons in the spring of the same year, but which had been defeated by the House of Lords; with the result that the fateful words still remained in the oath, the words which, according to a passage contained in the bill [Clause 5], the Jews would be able to leave out.

Sir Frederic Thesiger and Mr. Newdegate protested, but the first reading took place without any great setbacks and ended with a victory for emancipation.[348]

The second reading took place on February 10th, 1858, likewise with no great debate, because Sir Frederic Thesiger tabled a motion which proposed the exclusion of the passage intended for the Jews [Clause 5]. But he never got to make his case, because the bill was first put in front of a committee.[349]

The final debate before Parliament was delayed by the fall of Palmerston's cabinet. Then the Conservative Party, led by Lord Derby, came to power. In the beginning, the philo-Semites abandoned their hopes of soon being able to reach their objectives, because only a few months earlier, Lord Derby had been the head of the Jews' adversaries in the House of Lords. But confidence returned when Lord Derby admitted some of the biggest supporters of the Jewish cause into his cabinet as ministers, among them Lord Stanley (his own son), Attorney-General Sir Fitzroy Kelly, and lastly Disraeli, who had risen to become the Chancellor of the Exchequer and whom 'the

346 *Morning Post*, 11/7/1857. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
347 *Morning Post*, 21/7/1857, 22/7/1857, 29/7/1857. Translator's note: Quotation inserted for perceived reader interest, reproduced verbatim from the 29/7/1857 *Morning Post* issue.
348 *Hansard*, Volume 148, pp. 469-99.
349 *Hansard*, Volume 148, pp. 1084-118.

Tories now reluctantly and shamefacedly acknowledge for their chief in the House of Commons'.[350] These men had a lot of influence over Lord Derby, and it was not long before he too showed no inclination towards a committed stance on the issue.

In view of this, on March 18th, 1858, the House of Commons returned to debating on the bill introduced by Lord John Russell which had still not been dealt with. The longstanding great orator against the Jewish cause, Sir Frederic Thesiger, had ascended under the new government to the rank of Lord Chancellor, whereupon he was bestowed the title of Baron Chelmsford, and as such was no longer a member of Parliament, but a member of the House of Lords. In these difficult days of the final battle, the mission thus fell to Mr. Newdegate to lead the House of Commons' adversaries on his own. He thus tabled the amendment initially announced by Sir Frederic Thesiger in the previous session, which sought to remove Clause 5, the specific passage which would permit Jews to omit the Oath of Abjuration's final words.

In the course of the debates it was quickly observed that the number of the Jews' adversaries had considerably diminished, as was confirmed at the division. Newdegate's motion was defeated by a large majority and shortly afterwards the second reading passed. The third reading, on April 12th, did not even bring a division worthy of mention.[351]

With incredible speed the bill was sent up to the House of Lords. Evidently it was intended to capitalise on the sound defeat of the anti-Jewish faction, since already by the day after the third reading in the Commons, the bill was debated for the first time in the Lords. As in the majority of cases, on this occasion was there no attempt at any counter-argument during the first reading.[352]

The second reading was due to take place soon afterwards because the government did everything possible to accelerate it, and only a week later the much-anticipated debate took place amid great tension. The House of Lords awaited the debate with the greatest interest, and were particularly keen to see what Lord Derby's position would be. Lord Derby, with the general consensus of those present, stated that he would welcome the alteration of the 'obsolete and quite unnecessary' parts of the oaths to meet modern needs, but in terms of the Jewish Question, he felt compelled to stand firm in his long-held point of view, despite the contrary opinion of at least three of his colleagues in the other House, and he would 'certainly support any Motion which may be made for that omission of that clause which exempts persons of the Jewish persuasion from taking the oath which, by this Bill, is imposed upon the rest of Her Majesty's subjects'. From his speech we also get the sense that he was desirous to have it known that his inexpedient contrarian stance was borne solely of the dictates of his conscience and his reason, which as a responsible statesman he was compelled to follow:

> I confess I much wish that I could say, honestly and conscientiously, that I had changed my opinion on this subject; because great inconvenience, to say the least, has resulted from the protraction of this discussion. But, my Lords, not having changed my opinion, not having seen any reason to change it, not being satisfied of the validity of the grounds on which the admission of the Jews to Parliament is supported, and not seeing in the circumstances of the case any reason for changing my course while my opinions remain the same, it is with some regret, but, at the same time, without hesitation, that I

350 Campbell: Volume 8, pp. 199-200. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
351 *Hansard*, Volume 149, pp. 294-305, 442, 466-550, 946.
352 *Hansard*, Volume 149, p. 946.

> am compelled to tell my noble and learned Friend, that for my part, I cannot this Session take a course different from that which I have pursued on former occasions.[353]

In the April 27th sitting, the man formerly known as Sir Frederic Thesiger, now Lord Chelmsford, took the floor. He pointed out that all of the reasons enumerated (the 'claims of the Jews') could not persuade him, the Englishman who had spent so long fighting against Jewish emancipation, to reject the evidence brought by the adversaries. He said that this was not a case of judging the matter based on a few exemplary Jewish individuals, but on the Jewish people as a whole, and declared:

> I need scarcely assure your Lordships that I am influenced by no personal feeling – that I am actuated by no prejudice upon this question. I feel only an earnest desire to support a principle which I believe to be necessary to maintain in order to secure the welfare and even the character of this country.

His speech went on at length about how admission of the Jews – as Jews – would necessarily de-Christianise the Parliament, given that, with no test of Christianity to be exacted from every individual, members of Parliament could no longer be held to the moral standards of the Gospel, and Jews as a group were known to possess 'the most inveterate hostility to the Christian religion'.

He reminded his fellow Lords that the maintenance of the Christian religion was 'the most essential of our legislative functions' because it was through the Christian religion that the rulers of the nation were consecrated to their duties:

> …and what are those duties? Not merely the control and direction of matters of lowly worldly policy, of earthly power, or commercial property; but the eternal welfare of the people is committed to our legislative guardianship.

For these and other reasons Lord Chelmsford moved to omit Clause 5, the specific passage in the bill which authorised Jews to omit the fateful last words of the oath, and exhorted his colleagues not to be pressured, 'against our judgement and our consciences' by the House of Commons, which was threatening to create a constitutional crisis over the matter. He warned that such an act of submission, in a bid to maintain political stability, would 'leave us nothing more than a registry office for the decrees of the House of Commons'.[354]

Lord Lyndhurst protested, but he could not prevent the vote ending in favour of the opposition led by Lord Chelmsford.[355]

As always, it has been shown once again that, despite all of the propaganda and the influence of powerful circles, the majority of the population wanted nothing to do with the Jews: a sign of a

---

353 *Hansard*, Volume 149, 1479. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.

354 *Hansard*, Volume 149, pp. 1758-68. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from the original source, and additional elements of the speech have been included for their perceived value to the reader.

355 *Hansard*, Volume 149, pp. 1477-1486, 1758-1797, 2009.

healthy opinion and of the strong resistance from the English nation of that time against the foreign infiltration that threatened their existence.

In the first months of 1858, the vast majority of the native population continued to be against the Jews being admitted into Parliament, as is shown by the evidence of the petitions sent to the two legislative Houses by cities, districts and private individuals. While around the time of the March 17th and 22nd debates numerous petitions arrived to Parliament that were against the Jewish bill, not a single one arrived that was in favour of the Hebrews.[356]

The populace's reactionary attitude was made even clearer during the debates that took place in the House of Lords, when Lord Lyndhurst, during his motion for a second reading, presented a single petition in favour of the Jews, while numerous individuals and some sixty cities, towns and districts asked that Jewish exclusion be continued.[357] There was an analogous situation on April 27th, when the Earl of Granville likewise presented a single pro-Jewish petition.[358] But the following day the overwhelming majority made their voices heard, when against 50 pro-Jewish petitions containing 2,793 signatures, a total of 224 anti-Jewish petitions with 11,359 signatures freshly revealed the true will of the people.[359]

As usual, the *Times* was not very happy at the course of events, but we have no wish to reproduce more of their emotional outbursts here; rather, we will only discuss their polemics inasmuch as they touch on the arguments of the anti-Jewish faction. With ever more evidence, the anti-Jewish faction was proving in Parliament and in the press that the Jewish Question was not just a religious issue, but that it mostly concerned many other factors. There was a fear of the Jewish amorality that was reflected in their doctrines and literature. The Hebrews continued to be rejected because they were foreign to the national body. The *Times* was incensed by such reasoning and declared that these statements could not refer to modern Jews, who had not suffered these problems for a long time. It was, therefore, monstrous that the English nation was criticising the Jewish race:

> But it is a fine thing for a *parvenu* nation like ourselves, barely a thousand years old, at this corner of the world, to find itself following in the path of obstinate old Pharaohs, big, insolent Philistines, Assyrians, Babylonians, Græco-Asiatic dynasties, Cæsars, and a thousand other Royal and Imperial persecutors, The persecution has always been of the wanton, capricious, and almost childish character; playing fast and loose with its victims, pampering, plundering, coaxing, insulting, giving a little line, and then pulling it up with a jerk…[360]

It is somewhat eye-opening that the *Times*, then as now the leading newspaper of England, had the audacity to judge its own nation as inferior to that of the Jews.

Once more then the Upper House had become an insurmountable bulwark. According to the English constitution, the amended bill had to return to the Lower House, where it had to be expressly ratified in its new form. Lord Russell, in irascible statements, pointed out that the

356 *Times*, 18/3/1858, 23/3/1858.
357 *Times*, 23/4/1858, 26/4/1858.
358 *Times*, 27/4/1858.
359 *Hansard*, Volume 149, p.1785.
360 *Times*, 18/3/1858, 23/3/1858. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from the 18/3/1858 issue.

Commons could not approve the amended bill, because it continued to bar Jews from access to Parliament.

On May 13th, the House of Commons also authorised for certain members – among whom Rothschild was again counted – to hold a conference with representatives from the House of Lords, in a bid to deal with the issue and in the hope of arriving at an agreement.[361] What an affront to the members of the House of Lords! It is surprising then, that they approved the Commons proposition and promised to appoint their own corresponding committee.[362]

The conference was soon held, which was of course attended by Rothschild,[363] and at which all of the various points of contention were covered. Seemingly, the members of the House of Lords promised that the matter would again soon be put to a debate and everything possible would be done to get the House of Lords to change their position. Indeed, on May 31st, the Earl of Lucan presented his fellow lords with the brief Report of the Conference which requested the striking out of Clause 5 (the final oath words which were so fateful for the Jews). He stated that it was not necessary to take as evidence of public opinion the public petitions which campaigned against Jewish admission, as 'the number of these petitions was extremely small', but rather in his opinion the Lords should consider important that 'it was a fact beyond all dispute, that nearly the entire press of the country supported the policy of admitting Jews to a seat in the Legislature'.[364]

Up until recently Lord Lucan had been one of the Jews' main adversaries in the House of Lords. It therefore was a source of painful consternation to see him, for no apparent reason, suddenly declare himself to be a supporter of the Jewish cause.

The House had still not got over its shock when another of the main members of the anti-Jewish faction, the Earl of Stanhope, likewise abandoned its ranks. In 1856 he had headed the House of Lords' opposition to the bill proposed by the MP Mr. Gibson. He attributed his conversion to 'the largely increased majority in the House of Commons in favour of the admission of Jews to Parliament. That majority had more than trebled in two years.' This for him was a much stronger sign than there being 'a majority in the country against the measure', a fact which was always assured by the Jews' adversaries and perhaps existing in reality, but never at all proven. In terms of the number of people in opposition, there did not exist, in his judgement, any sure way of measuring them; while the voting in Parliament was decisive. Admitting the Jews could not be anti-Christian, given that 'a considerable number of the right rev. Prelates, among others, had shown themselves favourable to the admission of the Jews'. He also pointed out that 'a Jewish gentleman had within the last two years been unanimously elected to occupy the high office of the Lord Mayor of London' and that 'the heads of all the great parties of the State by turns partook of that gentleman's hospitality, and exchanged compliments and courtesies with him'. In view of the reasons given, he saw himself obliged to recommend that the Jews be admitted.[365]

We cannot rid ourselves of the impression that the Earl of Stanhope was himself one of those men who were invited to these lavish Jewish banquets and 'exchanged compliments and courtesies'. This event shows with full proof the soundness of the principle that, when it comes to

361 *Hansard*, Volume 150, pp. 529, 530.
362 *Hansard*, Volume 150, pp. 763-4.
363 *Hansard*, Volume 150, 859, 1147.
364 *Hansard*, Volume 150, pp. 1139-42. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.
365 *Hansard*, Volume 150, pp. 1142-9. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.

the Jewish Question, no exceptions or limited allowances must be made, lest the principle be gradually and subtly undermined.

It was to be a day of surprises. Immediately after the Earl of Stanhope's speech ended, the Earl of Clancarty got up to speak. He had suddenly gone over to the anti-Jewish camp because, as he declared, in view of the fact that the Jewish Question had come to dominate the entirety of domestic political life, he had studied this issue in great detail. In his previous opinion, he had considered it unjust to deny the Jews certain rights as English citizens. But now he harboured serious misgivings that it was appropriate for him to stand for their cause, and he went on to give the reasons for his change of heart:

> Let the claims of the latter be admitted upon the principle contended for by the House of Commons in their fourth Reason against your Amendment – namely, that 'the infliction of disabilities upon any class of Her Majesty's subjects solely on account of their conscientious adherence to their faith, savours of persecution'; and you must admit, also, the Mohammedan, the Hindoo, heathens of every denomination (millions of whom at this moment are dependent upon the kind of government Parliament may impose upon the Indian empire), and the professed infidel, who is commonly quite as bigoted in his own peculiar views as the most superstitious votary of any false system of religion. Religious tests of every kind must be abolished as qualifications for access to the great Council of the Nation, for they could be of no possible value. Nor could you consistently any longer require the Sovereign to make profession of a particular form of religion: the King has as good an abstract right to hold and profess what religious opinions he pleases, as have the King's counsellors: so that, upon the principle contended for by the Commons, in time future government and the guardianship of the rights of a people at present blest with the enjoyment of freedom beyond any other nation in the world, might fall into the hands of a Sovereign of any, or of no religion, and of a godless Parliament.
>
> […]
>
> The House of Commons appears to have fallen into the error of regarding seats in Parliament and offices in the State as the inherent rights of British subjects intended for the individual benefit of the persons holding them. A participation in the government of this great country is, indeed, a great and distinguishing privilege; but it is still more to be regarded as a trust conferred for the benefit of the community,
>
> […]
>
> Looking back to Magna Charta the Barons of Runnymede in that, the first charter, of British liberty, notice the Jews only as money-lenders. History does not record their ever having taken arms in the country's defence, or ever having taken part in, or sought admission to the national councils, they have ever been and sought so to keep themselves in every country where they are found, a nation apart, aliens from all around them in blood, in religion, and in social interests. I believe, that the feeling among them generally is still the same, and certainly, but for the wishes and personal popularity of Baron Rothschild, backed by his enormous wealth and the great political weight of his family, we never should to this day have heard of the Jewish claims. I have not the

> honour of Baron Rothschild's acquaintance, but from all I have heard of him, I do not apprehend that if he should obtain his seat in Parliament his conduct would be other than that becoming a British legislator… A man so highly esteemed is not likely to do discredit to the choice of his constituents, or to be disposed to damage that free constitution under the protection of which he has preferred to live; but his admission, as a Jew, to the Councils of the nation would be subversive of the great and essential principle of the constitution which connects the maintenance of the Christian religion with the general government of the country.

The Earl of Clancarty cleared recognised the tactic of the Jews, which was to separate the main question from the principle, and due to his understanding of the real Jewish intention, arrived at the reactionary attitude towards emancipation. He cautioned his fellow Lords against 'seeking popularity', as the Lower House had done, and instead reminded them of their 'higher mission as hereditary legislators' which made it more especially their duty to act as 'guardians of the constitution'. Then followed another sensational event.[366]

Lord Derby showed himself willing to come to a compromise in order to solve the problem. He considered that the moment had come to listen to the majority in the House of Commons, which meant that he was required to forgo his own opinion. He could only do this if he could count on the full support of the population at large, but he had seen that the mood of the country was one of indifference towards the Jewish Question. It was likely that the proposition made by Lord Lucan was a solution, which, nevertheless, he would have to examine very carefully. It seemed to him that the best course would be for Lord Lucan's ideas to be specified in a dedicated bill, which is why his recommendation was to maintain the current position until the time came for the proposition to be dealt with in greater detail.[367]

What a skilful manoeuvre by the Prime Minister! To all appearances, firmly determined to cede to Jewish aspirations, he wished to gradually acclimatise public opinion to his stance that was opposed in every sense to his previous one. In reality, he had already changed his point of view when he approved Lord Lucan's 'compromise' solution in principle, although he wanted to see it delayed, if only for a short while.

As Secretary of State Lord Malmesbury also shared the Prime Minister's point of view, it seemed that the majority was against the immediate commencement of debates around Lucan's proposition, which was why the latter withdrew it for the interim.

Lord Lyndhurst, the leader of the philo-Semites, gave a long speech in which he enumerated the compelling reasons which made Jewish admission a necessity. At the end, he asked for the House not to insist upon amendments to the bill already passed by the House of Commons, that is, he asked for the direct admission of Jews to Parliament.[368]

Against this bill the Lord Chancellor Lord Chelmsford protested most vehemently. He impartially analysed the reasons expounded by the parliamentary committee for their decision and arrived at the conclusion that none of these reasons was sufficiently convincing to qualify the

366 *Hansard*, Volume 150, pp. 1149-56. Translator's note: All quotations and quoted elements from Clancarty's speech are reproduced verbatim from original source, and additional quotations have been inserted for their perceived historical interest.
367 *Hansard*, Volume 150, p. 1156 ff.
368 *Hansard*, Volume 150, pp. 1177-1185.

House of Lords' position as erroneous. The House of Lords then agreed to maintain their current position, but that 'a Committee [be] appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on their Amendments to the said Bill, to which the Commons disagree'.[369]

This agreement from the House of Lords, which seemed only provisional, was a true masterstroke of parliamentarianism: to accustom one's own ranks to the change in position, one gave the appearance of leaving things as they were. The new framing of the problem meant that valuable time was bought, which could then be used to apply pressure against the anti-Jews at a personal level, with the goal of thus winning ground for the final agreement. In any case, it was apparent that there was a desire to avoid any new debates on the issue, which could lead to hindrance or interruption of the procedures relating to the agreement in Parliament.

In the week which followed this sensational debate, two bills were introduced: one from Lord Lyndhurst[370] and the other from Lord Lucan. The first proposed that the three oaths were substituted by one single oath, and that certain necessary accommodations be created for the Jews. The second, known as 'Lord Lucan's bill', pursued the same objective,[371] authorising both constituent Houses to allow a Jewish member to exclude the fateful final words and to give analogous authorisation in any similar case.

But due to the absence of the Prime Minister the debates on these two bills were postponed for the interim.

On July 1st, 1858, the anxiously awaited debate took place in the House of Lords. The Prime Minister's definitive position continued to be publicly unknown. But this uncertainty soon disappeared when he became the first person to take the floor in the debate. After a brief listing of the numerous bills that had not merited approval from the Upper House, he declared that he had not changed his opinion in the slightest. Nevertheless, it was necessary to end the prevailing conflict between both Houses, which threatened to gravely imperil the entire political system. It was only because of this threat that he felt compelled to lend his support to one of the bills, which was why he stated his preference as being that of Lord Lucan.[372]

Although the Prime Minister's position had long seemed uncertain, the Chamber was surprised by his statement. Lord Lucan,[373] who supported his bill energetically, expressed that, in his judgement, the overarching mood in the country was one of the most perfect apathy and indifference to the admission of Jews to Parliament, for which reason the House of Lords could use their own judgement to decide what was best for the country.

Of the anti-Jewish faction, it was the Earl of Clancarty who was the first to take the floor. He first of all reproached the Prime Minister for having 'changed his colours' to favour the Jews:

> My noble and gallant Friend was the first to go over – he was the last from whom I should have apprehended such an example. I had always regarded him as a man of great determination, and from the gallant profession he belongs to, the least likely to have entertained a thought of yielding or turning; but I am bound to say that in announcing his change my noble Friend did state what at once disentitled the opponents

369 *Hansard*, Volume 150, p. 1185. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
370 *Hansard*, Volume 150, p.1600.
371 *Hansard*, Volume 150, pp. 1619-98.
372 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 693.
373 *Hansard*, Volume 151, pp. 702-704.

> of the Jewish claims any longer to expect his co-operation; nay, he showed conclusively that his vote should always have been given on the other side.[374]

What he found most regrettable was that Lord Derby had not hesitated in declaring that his stance on the issue would remain unchanged, but that he had only surrendered out of expediency. A compromise on one of the greatest principles of the constitution! Inconceivable, for principles will tolerate no compromise and will never change!

Lord Berners equally rejected a compromise on such an important matter of principle. If the principle was shattered, the danger which he apprehended 'was not a collision with the House of Commons, but with the Crown itself, should once a Radical Prime Minister accede to office, and create a Jew Member of their Lordships' House'. And a Jew in the House of Lords would mean that, from that point on, 'neither their Lordships' House nor the monarchy would be longer safe'.[375]

The Duke of Cleveland[376] and the Earl of Granville[377] declared themselves in favour of the compromise, while the Duke of Rutland declared that, despite unproven claims to the contrary, the majority House of Commons' opinion on this matter 'was no accurate test of the real desire of the country' and that Jewish emancipation would be 'repugnant to… the best interest of the people of England'. For this reason alone, the compromise had to be rejected.[378]

The Bishop of Oxford and the Viscount of Dungannon[379] both declared that in many respects they would prefer a Muslim to a Jew, as they saw the Muslim as closer to the Christian faith. In the words of the Bishop, which were seconded by the Viscount: 'The Jew declared that the Central Point of the Christian faith was an imposter, and the Mohammedan at least, admitted our Saviour to have been the second of Prophets.'[380]

But this time all of the opposition's efforts were in vain, even in the House of Lords. For the first time, the philo-Semites triumphed, with 143 votes to 97. The *volte-face* of the Prime Minister had clearly taken its toll.

It was decided to advance Lord Lucan's bill to a second reading and refer it to a Committee of the Whole House on the following Monday.[381] The Committee added two further paragraphs; according to the first, the Jews were to continue to be excluded from, among other things, regency control, and the positions of Lord Chancellor and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The second prohibition, that of Lord Chancellor, is still in force and its content is that the right to represent the prebends of the Church passes to the Archbishop of Canterbury as soon as this enters the radius of any office held by a Jew in the Crown's domain.

The bill, thus amended, passed to the third reading in the House of Lords on July 12th. The opposition did not appear to be disheartened in the slightest.

---

374 *Hansard*, Volume 151, pp. 704-713. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.
375 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 713. Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.
376 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 715.
377 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 715.
378 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 717. Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.
379 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 725.
380 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 721. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
381 *Hansard*, Volume 151, pp. 726-30. Translator's note: Note that this vote took place Thursday, July 1st, so the next stage was voted to take place only two working days later.

This time it was the Earl of Harrington who distinguished himself as the most impassioned orator of the anti-Jewish faction:

> My next reason for opposing the admission of Jews into our Parliament is, that they are the great money-lenders – the great loan contractors of the world. It may be said that they do lend to all alike, that they are more free-traders in money. Yes; it matters not to them whether they lend their money to support a good or a bad cause; to support liberty or despotism; to further the great ends of their own country, or to lend their money to a nation directly opposed to it. Hence it follows, that the despotic nations of the world, now unfortunately in the ascendant, are enabled to keep up large standing armies in times of peace, and to make other nations, and to make England do so likewise, because they do well know, that when the occasion requires it, either to put down the rising spirit of reform in their own countries, or to act against other states, they can call on these loan contractors for the sinews of war. The consequence is, that the nations of the world are groaning under heavy systems of taxation, and of national debts…
>
> […]
>
> It may be said, why persecute the many on account of the misdeeds of the few? Why persecute the whole Jewish race, some 30,000 in this country, on account of certain loan contractors, who have lent, or may lend, their money to despots – who make use of this Jew wealth to destroy the liberties of Poland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, or other nations? Why, for the reasons just stated, and because 'the many' are the great contributors – not only here, but in every other country to these loans, and but for their contributions, these loans would with difficulty be carried out. Besides, these *millionaires*, these loan contractors, are the very men who would stand on your public hustings and make their impassioned, their sweet orations in favour of public liberty – whereas, they have ever been the greatest enemies to freedom. Why, I would ask, and for what have they been ennobled? Is it, or is it not, for having lent their gold to despots? My Lords, these loan contractors are the pets, the Poloniuses of arbitrary Courts.

He then went on to analyse the reason why Jews had been elected in some electoral districts, and why, with what had already been seen of events, the Hebrews could not be trusted:

> Yes, but the constituencies are not Jews – they would not elect these loan contractors. My Lords, I would not trust them. I do well remember that some few years back, it was in 1853, not less than sixty constituencies were accused of corruption, and as many election committees sat for months investigating these matters, and by their investigations pointing out certain remedies for the future. Above thirty of these constituencies were found guilty. Would you then again open the flood gates of corruption? My Lords, I contend that a loan contractor, be he Christian or be he Jew, who would lend his money to support despotism, would not deserve the proud honour of a seat in the House of Commons. My Lords, I would rather see a good Mohammedan, or Hindoo, sitting in the House of Commons, than I would a Jew loan

> contractor. In point of fact, would it not be far more natural, more just, that 180,000,000 of British subjects should have a representative in the House of Commons, to point out how the tax screw pauperises and tortures… than that a few Jews should have their representatives there? Why there never was a few men in any great State who possessed such a mighty influence as these Jews do here at this moment. Have they not a considerable body of this House voting for them? Have they not a majority in the House of Commons? Add to this a portion of the Press – the most powerful political engine that ever existed, all supporting them. (*Hear!*) Yes, but there is a power still stronger than all these combined, and that power is the moral and religious people of this country, who, however seemingly apathetic, are decidedly opposed to the admission of Jews into Parliament.[382]

He saw himself obliged once more to warn against the Jews, who had forced all of the nations to take on huge national debts, under the heavy yoke of which the entire world suffered greatly. For all of these reasons, the Hebrews did not deserve for their power to be increased still further with their admission to Parliament.

In a bid to counter such strong statements, Lord Derby replied that there were also Christian usurers.[383]

The Earl of Harrington responded that he had long predicted the regrettable result of all of these parliamentary battles. 'He, however, ventured to remind the noble Earl [the Earl of Derby], and the House, that during the last Crimean war, large sums of money were sent by Jews and others from this country to Holland, as contributions to a Russian loan.' This loan was then used by Russia, England's bitterest enemy, to aid in prolonging the war against England and her allies. 'An Act was subsequently passed, making it a misdemeanour for any British subject to subscribe to a loan raised by the enemy. Could then, the loan contractor, the head and front of the offending party, be deemed a proper subject to sit in Parliament?'[384]

There followed an equally rousing speech from the Earl of Galloway. He 'foresaw that the time might not be far distant when a profligate Prime Minister of this country might receive a large bribe for recommending the creation of a Jewish peer'. Galloway was sufficiently astute to pre-empt the predictable argument from the other side that this would not be possible:

> It might be said upon the other hand that the House [of Lords] would have the power of rejecting such a peer; but it was by a very small majority indeed that the Jews had been excluded from the House, and when he recalled to mind how many peers might be added to that House in a few years, he could picture the creation of a number of peers, sufficient to vote for the admission of Jews, the Minister for the time being recommending it, so that the House might be inundated with admissions of that description.[385]

---

382 *Hansard*: Volume 151, p. 1261 ff. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.
383 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1264.
384 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1264. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.
385 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1265. Translator's note: Quotations reproduced verbatim from original source.

All efforts were once again futile. The third reading also won a majority, with which the Jews had practically won the fight.

As it is not easy to comprehend the situation in its entirety, the following brief summary may be instructive:

As is known, the House of Commons first passed a bill which provided for the exclusion of the oath words which were impossible for the Jews, but it was rejected by the House of Lords, who amended the bill to ensure that the most crucial excluded words were reinserted. According to the constitution, the bill had to be approved by the Commons in this new, amended format. A House of Commons committee rejected this supplementary text with the well-known nine points and argued their various objections with representatives from the House of Lords. The issue was left in paralysis by the bill which had meanwhile been passed by the House of Lords [Lord Lucan's bill], because the attention of both Houses was now focussed on the aforementioned events taking place in the House of Lords. After it had been passed by the Lords, the Commons now had to deal with the new bill as well as deal with the previous amended bill, and then have it approved by the House of Lords. An unexpected twist: the House of Lords had not withdrawn their protest against the first bill, but continued to insist that the essential final words of the oath be included.[386]

With astonishing speed, the House of Commons began the debates on the two bills.

On July 16th, 1858, that is, four days after the approval of Lord Lucan's bill in the House of Lords, the Jewish Question was once more back on the Order Paper of the Commons Chamber.

Lord John Russell was first to introduce a motion to propose that the House proceed to the second reading of Lord Lucan's bill. That day must surely have been the greatest of his parliamentary career, for he had finally achieved the goal that he had pursued with such tenacity: the admission of the Jews to Parliament. It was beyond doubt that the Commons would likewise reach the majority necessary to pass the bill that had already been passed in the House of Lords. Nevertheless, the anti-Jewish faction put up a defence until the very last. The main burden of the struggle was borne on Mr. Newdegate's shoulders.

He took the floor as soon as Lord John Russell's motion was presented:

> I desire not to speak disrespectfully to this House when I say that I am firmly convinced – more firmly convinced perhaps than I have ever been – that those who advocate the admission of the Jews to Parliament do not truly represent the feelings of the people of this country; I say this because, that since it has been felt that this change in the law is now, I fear, inevitable, I have seen no indications of satisfaction on the part of the people in whose name the change has been urged. I therefore feel entitled to assume that the measure has been forced upon the country; for, so far as I can observe, the only feeling which the probability of its passing has caused throughout the kingdom is one of disappointment, enhanced, perhaps, by the fact that the proposed change is to be effected by the powerful aid of one from whom such a measure was little to be expected. Hon. Members opposite can show me no demonstrations of satisfaction to prove that, in seeking to abrogate the Christian character of Parliament, they are acting thoroughly in accordance with public opinion.
>
> […]

386 *Hansard*, Volume 151, pp. 1243-1257.

> I can regard this as no settlement whatever. It marks our first entrance upon a new phase of political existence for the country. It is the first step in a course which I myself view with the greatest apprehension; and I very much doubt whether many hon. Gentlemen on the other side have weighed the extent of the change which they are about to effect; but of this I am confident, that wherever in a State this principle has been introduced, where-ever a State that was Christian by its constitution has ceased to be so, the freedom of that State has not been long maintained; and I challenge hon. Gentlemen to produce me an instance to the contrary.[387]

The honourable member Mr. Spooner[388] supported Mr. Newdegate and added, among other points, that up until the July of that session there had been only two petitions before the House in favour of Jewish admission, and those petitions had contained two signatures, whereas there had been 250 petitions received that were against the measure, and these were signed by a total of 11,808 persons.

But all resistance was in vain: the second reading of Lord Lucan's bill was approved by 156 votes to 65.

The third reading of the bill, which took place on July 21st, 1858, could not now yield an uncertain outcome, although once more during the event the anti-Jewish camp defended their position with the fortitude of brave men making their last stand. Mr. Warren reminded the House that the 'admission of Jews into the Legislature is opposed to public opinion and the wishes of the people, which ought to be distinctly ascertained by means of a general election before taking a step so seriously affecting the constitution of the Legislature'. He also pointed out that the petitions received during that session up until the day of his speech regarding Jewish emancipation showed a total of 14,500 petitioners against the bill, with those in favour 'only between 300 and 400', obvious proof of the true opinion of the people. He did not harbour the least doubt that if the bill became law it would be 'derogatory to the dignity of this House… the usual organs will announce to the country and the world at large that the result was received with vehement cheering; but from that moment I believe will date the decline of the moral and religious influence of the House of Commons'.[389]

Newdegate again got up to speak, and used this final juncture to make a personal *j'accuse* against another member of the House, whose covert actions Newdegate had evidently been observing for some time:

> I do not defend the conduct of Lord Derby, who has agreed to a measure contrary to his principles, because I think he ought to have appealed to the country. I see, in the form of this measure, that it is the intention of its framers to give this House time to reflect, which, in reality, is a recognition of the fact that the country ought to have been appealed to. I cannot say anything in condemnation of the principle of this Bill, and of its tendency to destroy the Christian character of this House, that I have not already

387 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1615 ff. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source, with the second paragraph inserted for its historical interest.

388 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1620.

389 *Hansard*: Volume 151, 1889. Translator's note: All quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source. Warren's speech also lets it be known that Baron Rothschild is watching proceedings from the Peers' Gallery.

> ventured to state; but when the conduct of Lord Derby is assailed, I cannot bear all the imputations which are heaped upon him, without calling attention to the difficulties of his position. Now, who has been the main promoter of this infraction of the Christian character of Parliament on this side of the House? Why, the Chancellor of the Exchequer [Disraeli]. We know that the Chancellor of the Exchequer – himself of Jewish extraction – fosters towards the Jewish race feelings which one can trace in almost every work of fiction which he has written. Especially do we find that feeling honestly and frankly declared in the chapter which he has interpolated in his biography of Lord George Bentinck. He claims as the right of the Jewish race the government of the other races of mankind, and claims for them this supremacy, whilst they remain in the present state of rebellion against their own true King…
>
> When, therefore, I see sitting on these benches, and taking a leading part among the members of this party, one holding these opinions, who has declared them, and uses his influence to carry them into effect, I will not hear Lord Derby's difficulties underrated in regard to this question. I have seen several leading Members of the Conservative Party brought over to his opinions by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. And when the noble Lord at the head of the India Board seceded from his noble father's opinions on this question, and joined the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I felt that Lord Derby's position, sooner or later, might become intolerable, and that there was great danger that by degrees he would be forced from the high position which he has held for many years, as leader of the great party whose pride it still is to be the defenders of the Christian character of Parliament and of the State. In my anger I will have justice – I will not hear Lord Derby's difficulties undervalued; and although I lament that he has succumbed, I see in this a manifestation of a weakness, which is natural, however much it is to be deplored.[390]

But not even this new warning from Newdegate about the Jews' real intentions was enough to impede the bill being passed. With 129 votes to 55, the adversaries of the Jews were finally vanquished. Thus ended the last battle for Jewish emancipation.

390 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1895. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source. Interestingly, Newdegate then goes to expound at length his belief in a Jesuit plot to undermine the Revolution of 1688, using Liberalism (in his words, 'pseudo-Liberalism') as its revolutionary vanguard.

Judah Has Triumphed

Immediately after the division, Lord John Russell stood up and reminded the House that the previous bill still had to be dealt with, according to which the Lords called for the final oath words, so injurious to Jewish interests, to remain in the oath. ‘The Lords had sent down the general Reasons which moved them to exclude the Jews from Parliament in any case whatever, but had accompanied those Reasons by another Bill which provided for the admission of Jews. Of course, that being so, it was unnecessary for this House to resist the Lords' Amendments, because their Lordships had departed from their own Reasons.’ Therefore, in view of such a contradiction, it was sufficient for the House to considered the matter settled and to proceed from this position.[391]

The MP Spooner similarly opined that the Lords’ objections now no longer had a point to them and proposed a motion that Lord Russell’s motion to the House be supplemented with the words ‘that said Bill being in direct contravention to the clear and cogent reasons assigned by their Lordships against the enactments of such Bill [the admission of the Jews to Parliament]’.[392]

But Mr. Spooner’s motion was rejected. It was likely that there was no desire on Parliament’s part to highlight the esteemed Lords’ indignity at having put themselves in this self-contradictory position.

Parliament then came to the resolution that ‘this house does not consider it necessary to examine the Reasons offered by the Lords for insisting upon the exclusion of Jews from Parliament, as by a Bill of the present Session, intituled “An Act to provide for the Relief of Her Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion,” their Lordships have provided means for the admission of persons professing the Jewish Religion to Seats in the Legislature’.[393]

The content of the resolution was practically the same as Mr. Spooner’s motion, except that it did not make the contradiction in the Lords’ actions so obvious.

With this decision it was possible to put an end to the 28-year battle between the Jews and their adversaries.

On July 23rd, 1858, the Queen gave the Royal Assent to Lord Lucan’s bill, which thus brought it into law.[394]

A few days later Rothschild presented himself at Parliament and was sworn in, thus becoming, for the first time, a legal member of the House with full parliamentary rights.

As the reader will remember, July 16th saw the second reading of Lord Lucan’s bill, which was the decisive reading for most bills. The Jews’ adversaries realised at that point that the battle was to all intents and purposes lost. As a last resort there was nothing left but an appeal to Queen Victoria, who had to give the Royal Assent to the bill that would soon be passed. According to the old English constitution, every Englishman had a right to beseech the Queen to deny the Royal Assent.

For this reason, on July 19th a number of barristers addressed the following carefully worded petition to the Queen:

---

391 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1902. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
392 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1903. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
393 *Hansard*, Volume 151, pp. 1905-6. Translator’s note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
394 *Hansard*, Volume 151, p. 1967.

To Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen.
The humble Petition of the Members of the
English Bar whose names are underwritten:

Sheweth,

That, because Christianity is interwoven with the laws of England, and because every Jew who has a sincere attachment to the faith of his forefathers must be averse to Christianity; we consider that a Jew cannot be a fit Legislator for the Realm of which Your Majesty, by the Grace of God, is Queen: and therefore humbly pray Your Majesty to withhold the Royal Assent from a Bill introduced into the House of Lords with a view of admitting Jews to sit in Parliament.

The petition was deposited in the Post Office so early on the morning of Tuesday, July 20th, that, if duly delivered, it must have been received at the Home Office before the start of business on the same day.[395]

The English authorities were (and are still today) known as people who to least acknowledge receipt of a document on the day it is received. But in contravention of this general rule, the petitioners were only notified on the 23rd of July that 'any Petition to The Queen respectfully and properly worded, which is transmitted to this Office, will be laid before Her Majesty'.[396]

As a consequence, the response, or better said the rejection letter, arrived the very day that the Royal Assent was being given to the Jewish bill.

Edison rightly notes that it is extraordinary that the petitioners – barristers by profession and so experts in such matters – would not have chosen the correct form.[397]

Furthermore, in any case, one would have been able to expect that the petitioners were notified by July 21st at the very latest. The petitioners could then have asked a Peer to pass the petition directly to the Queen during an audience. The necessary back-up measures would have already been taken in the eventuality of the Home Office presenting difficulties. Undoubtedly, among the highest-born aristocrats they would have found at least one lord who was perfectly willing to make use of his right, as a hereditary counsellor of the Crown, to present the petition to the Queen by July 22nd at the latest.

With an immediate response, the matter of the petition's wording could have been cleared up in a timely manner by personal interview, and that the corresponding changes made.

In view of what happened, one cannot but get the impression that the intention was to stop, by whatever means necessary, the petition being presented to the Queen before she could give the Royal Assent; otherwise there is no explanation for the fact that the Home Office waited until the day that the bill was made law to give a response, especially because this response was a refusal to process the document for supposed wording issues.

---

395 Edison: *The Question*, pp. 14-15. Translator's note: Petition reproduced verbatim from original source.
396 Edison: *The Question*, p. 17. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.
397 Edison: *The Question*, p. 15 ff.

The 28-year battle for Jewish emancipation was over. How dishonourably had the anti-Jewish resistance been demolished! But before giving our opinion on this event, we must first see what the press had to say.

Specifically in the last months leading up to emancipation, the *Morning Post* had directed its fire most bitterly against the Jews, whom it continued to see as an existential threat to English life: 'Civil and religious liberty,' it emphasised, 'has nothing to do with this matter, but Mammon worship undoubtedly has'.[398]

Regarding the earlier stages of the political battle, we have often seen the *Morning Post*'s opinion of the House of Lord's position, which it applauded every time the House of Lords repulsed a Jewish attack. But as indicated by the following excerpt [reproduced verbatim] from the June 14th 1858 issue, the *Morning Post* had run out of sympathy:

> …the House of Lords, by the policy which it has pursued, has placed itself in a most extraordinary and discreditable position. Yielding to the pressure of the House of Commons, it has passed Lord Lucan's measure, and yet it has carried, by a considerable majority, reasons for disagreeing to the first Jew Bill, which, if they mean anything at all, mean that the Jew, as an impugner of the Christian faith, ought to take no part in the legislation of a Christian country.
>
> […]
>
> If their lordships' reasons be valid, the measure which they have sanctioned must be altogether inexpedient and unnecessary. But the surrender of a high duty which the Lords have made, as well as the transparently inconsistent nature of their proceedings, fully justifies Lord John Russell in saying that the House of Commons possesses a paramount power in the State.
>
> […]
>
> …we cannot conceive anything more damaging to the independence and character of the House of Lords than a proceeding which declares on the part of their lordships a cowardly submission to expediency, not to say pressure, and at the same time seeks to gratify a foregone and determinate conclusion by reasons which, if they are worth anything, demonstrate that their conclusion is utterly and hopelessly inconsistent and indefensible.
>
> […]
>
> Five-and-twenty years ago the Lords gave way on the subject of the Reform Bill, at a time when the alternative was a swamping of the peerage or a revolution. In this present instance their lordships have given way to the threats of the Commons, and they have done more – they have exhibited a degree of cowardly subserviency which has only rendered more clear and more emphatic the reasons by which they have supported their conclusion that members of the Jewish nation ought not to sit in a Christian Legislature. A precedent has therefore been set, which, we regret to say, may to-morrow be

398 'Morning Post', 11/3/1858, 18/3/1858, 19/4/1858, 23/4/1858, 28/4/1858, 29/4/1858, 12/5/1858, 2/7/1858, 6/7/1858, 14/7/1858. Translator's note: Quoted sentence reproduced verbatim from the 18/3/1858 issue.

> effectually invoked for the purpose of ignoring the independent discretion and free action of the House of Lords.

In an article of July 6th [excerpt below reproduced verbatim from original source], it once more unleashed its full fury at the course of events:

> The House of Commons, when this Bill is passed, may resolve that Baron Rothschild be seated, and he will be seated accordingly. Then we shall see the spectacle of a man who loathes and derides the Christian religion, who rejects and scorns the claims of that Divine Being whose incarnation is the keystone of all Christian hope, and who, by the tradition of his fathers, is bound to regard the Gentile world as a race of dogs, and Christians as something worse, sitting in a professedly Christian assembly, making laws affecting Christianity, affecting the Church, her ministers, and her lay rights; and we shall have Lord John Russell looking complacently on and declaring it to be the legitimate and proper development of the English Constitution. Verily this is progress! And progress at the hands of a Conservative Ministry and by its aid.
>
> Never was anything more unaccountable than the energy which the Conservatives have shown in passing Whig measures, and foregoing all that they have hitherto held and taught as essential to the safety of the country and the preservation of honest legislation.

In the course of its short existence, the youthful *Daily Telegraph* had become one of the main cheerleaders in the fight for the Jewish cause. In March 1858, when its perspective was still not too refined, it directed its ire mainly at Mr. Newdegate. According to an editorial of the March 24th issue [excerpt reproduced verbatim from original source]: ‘It is not fit that Mr. Newdegate, who is intellectually unworthy to occupy a seat in Parliament, should be beaten every year in order that an inferior section in an inferior House should gain a victory.’

When the probability of victory began to lean more and more towards the side of the Jews, the *Daily Telegraph* continued pouring mockery on Newdegate, while at the same time lionising the Jewish race. It exclaimed triumphantly:

> The ten years’ debate is concluded; the Peers have yielded to the Commons; Mr. Newdegate, unless his sincerity should induce him to resign, will be compelled to sit under the same roof with Baron Rothschild; and Lord Chelmsford, from the elevation of the woolsack itself, will, in powerless exasperation, witness the entrance of a Jew into the British Parliament…
>
> …there is no imaginable reason why a Jewish member of Parliament should not serve his country with quite as much distinction, and with far more sincerity, than many a leading Whig or thoroughbred Tory. It is not for the Conservatives, at any rate, to disparage the intellect that warms the blood of the Hebrew nation…

> No one can pretend to be ignorant that Mr. Disraeli is Jewish to the inmost fibre of his frame, that he was born a Jew, that he was consecrated as a Jew, that he is a Jew in spite of recantation. At all events, he belongs to the people whom Mr. Newdegate holds to be accursed; and yet Conservatism follows his lead, because its own mind has been exhausted, and because he can supply the mental and intellectual deficiencies of his party…
>
> …but, at all times, the Jewish mind has been one of superior business capacity – large, firm, quick-sighted, and retentive; these have been its intellectual traditions for hundreds of years…[399]

The *Daily News* and the *Spectator* wallowed, as they say, in praise for what had been achieved. Surely soon there would also be a Jewish Peer in the House of Lords. For the actions of the Lords, the people who had made the triumph possible, they only had words of disdain, and these were directed at the Lords' contradictory behaviour.[400]

The *Times*, naturally, applauded the course of events, but felt nothing but contempt for the Lords' and the Conservative government's conduct. In its opinion, 'for the promotion of any Liberal measure, a Whig ought to be in opposition, a Conservative in office'.[401] But no article better reflected the *Times*' scorn for the Lords than its editorial of July 21st:

> …The best-bred gentlemen in the world have, in Parliament assembled, just committed a *gaucherie* of the grossest description. Twenty Jews dressed in full gabardines, and swearing by Moses, could not have inflicted so staggering a blow to the dignity of our House of Lords as that House has in its blindness dealt itself. The Lords have spoken brave words, and have eaten the leek. They have emancipated the Jews, and have favoured the House of Commons with certain 'Reasons' why they ever had refused and ever would refuse to emancipate them. They have not yielded with a protest; they have not said, with a certain lordly scorn, 'Well, well, let these clamorous Commons have their own way; it is scarcely decorous for us to contend longer with them,' but they have themselves initiated the thing they abhor. The Jew Bill is a Lord's Bill – volunteered by the Lords – passed by the Lords. The position of Lord Derby and his Peers is not that of the tolerant Mussulman who allows a Christian to eat pig in his presence, merely holding his own nose and turning away his eyes from the abomination. Their act is that of the obsequious Moslem who goes and fetches the pork, offering it to his Christian master, but crying out all the time that the Prophet will terribly punish all who eat pork. 'Never,' say the House of Lords, 'will we pass the Oaths Bill, because the Jews always were excluded, because exclusion from seats in Parliament on the ground of religious opinion is a principle, because the Jewish disbelief constitutes a moral unfitness to take part in legislation, and because we have always shown a firm adherence to the principle of keeping Parliament an exclusively Christian assembly. We can't do it – it is impossible. But, while we are discussing

399 *Daily Telegraph*, 11/5/1858, 15/5/1858, 2/7/1858, 3/7/1858. Translator's note: Text excerpts reproduced verbatim from the 3/7/1858 issue.
400 *Daily News*, 11/5/1858, 1/6/1858, 2/7/1858; *Spectator*, 1/5/1858, 15/5/1858, 5/6/1858, 3/7/1858.
401 *Times*, 11/6/1858, 14/6/1858. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from the 11/6/1858 issue.

> Parliamentary matters, here is a Bill which we have passed, and which we should be glad if you will consent to. It is called "A Bill for the Relief of Her Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion." It is to enable the Jews to sit in either House of Parliament.' Anybody who can read may see that this is a fair abstract of the Lords' 'Reasons' and of the Lords' Jew Bill. What can be said to such implacable talkers and to such docile actors?
>
> […]
>
> Had the Lords held out for five years longer they would not have done their Order so much harm as they have by the manner of this surrender. We English have a great admiration for dignity, but we have a very critical eye for the article. We have, moreover, a strong sense of the ridiculous; and surely nothing can be more ridiculous than presenting your sword hilt and at the same moment shouting out 'No surrender!'… Unfortunately, they have acted under the counsels of some who seem to think that it is not inconsistent with the true dignity of English gentlemen to say one thing and to do another…
>
> [Reproduced verbatim from original source]

Undoubtedly, the Jews' success in 1858 has to be attributed mainly to two men: Disraeli and Lord Derby. For this reason we are going to take a look at what the press thought of these two figures.

When, as it seemed, the Jews had been newly defeated in the spring of 1858, the philo-Semitic press solely blamed Disraeli for the fiasco. The *Spectator* of May 1st reproached him with the following [reproduced verbatim from original source]:

> So little has Mr. Disraeli done for the measure which he has professed to support alike on the score of his race and of his judgement.

Similarly, the *Times* of April 28th found only the bitterest words for him:

> For the conduct of Lord Derby and the Lord Chancellor [Lord Chelmsford] the country might have been prepared; but what we have reason to complain of is the weakness and political cowardice of another member of the Cabinet. Mr. Disraeli has identified himself with the cause of Jewish emancipation. He has written on the Jewish race; he has not only apologized for them, but he has glorified them above all races. If there is any point on which he might be supposed sincere, it is the deliverance of the burden which persecution formerly laid on them; and never had any man so fair an opportunity of accomplishing a great work…
>
> [Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source.]

What a change of tune from the same newspaper two months later! They did not only congratulate Disraeli for the triumph, but they also applauded him as ‘a politician of genius’. It is not necessary, of course, that we linger on this *volte-face*, because even for a newspaper like the *Times* it must have been somewhat unprecedented to go from branding someone a ‘coward’ to a few weeks later lauding him as ‘a politician of genius’.[402]

On the other hand, the totality of the press – of both supporters and adversaries – showed itself to be quite of one mind, notwithstanding the notable exceptions of the *Daily News* and the *Times*,[403] regarding the conduct of Lord Derby. We do not wish to reproduce here the judgements of the newspapers which had been anti-Jewish up until then, except to say that it is to be understood that the most serious accusations were made against him. We will discuss rather the viewpoints of the philo-Semitic camp, which had every reason to be grateful to him. But on the contrary, they only expressed scorn for this archetype of the parliamentary system, and they gave him what he deserved.

The *Daily Telegraph* made every effort imaginable to expose him to public contempt; in its article of July 2nd it hurled its most vitriolic abuse [reproduced verbatim from original source]:

> Lord Derby did penance last night, with his neck in the Liberal halter, and with the worst grace conceivable acquiesced in a compromise on the Oath’s question. Never, perhaps, did a Minister of the Crown stand so humbled in the presence of the Legislature and of public opinion. He was in truth retracting the policy of a life-time, avowedly deserting a principle he holds sacred to keep his party in office – creating a schism among his followers in order to pacify his opponents – digesting, in fact, the bitterest mortification for the sake of overcoming a political difficulty. While he was in the attitude of contrition – while he was stifling his pride – while he was doing that which made the elders of the Conservative peerage ashamed of their leader, he might surely have adopted a less pitiable evasion than Lord Lucan’s bill…
>
> […]
>
> For ten years Lord Derby opposed the admission of Jews, and was supported by his party; Mr. Newdegate was not more vehement; and again and again Parliament was implored not to challenge the divine wrath by forsaking the principle that righteousness exalteth a nation. But now, the loaves and fishes have worked a miracle, and the head of the House of Stanley appears like a heretic in buckram who has been terrified into orthodoxy, with the penitential bill in one hand and his reasons for accepting it in the other – with Lord John Russell’s maxims sealed to his forehead, and Lord Chelmsford’s appeals lying at his feet, preparatory to being burned by the common hangman. So passes away the glory of Conservatism…

This brief summary of the main press opinion renders our critique of the last battles and the defeat quite redundant. We have hardly anything to add to the judgement on Lord Derby. What an irony of history, that it was he of all people, after so many years of being at the front of the fight against the Jews, who was the one that at the decisive moment helped them to victory, after a few

402 *Times*, 3/7/1858. Translator’s note: The quoted term ‘a politician of genius’ is as it appears in the original article.
403 *Daily News*, 2/7/1858; *Times*, 2/7/1858.

months before he had repelled their attacks by sticking to his principles. Even during the days that he turned his coat he continued to hold fast to his principles, according to his own words. How could he then do something that was contrary to them in every way? The explanation can only be that, as the archetype of the parliamentary politician, he could not longer keep track of his contradictory manoeuvring.

Perhaps his reasoning can be explained from the perspective of a desire to keep his position at all costs, or because pressure had been exerted on him by the Jews or the Jews' supporters. Disraeli was part of his cabinet, as during that period he had risen to become the leader of the Conservatives, so he would have been able to undermine the ancient bastion against Judaism from the inside. It was not for nothing that some newspapers wrote that the Conservative Party had had to surrender itself to a Jew, in order to get new ideas. In these bitter words there is a lot of truth, because it is only this way that it has come to be possible that within the English Conservative Party today one finds theories that can only be Jewish in origin.

We have still to discuss in depth the subject of Disraeli the man. Only one thing needs to be said before we do this, and that is, that nobody did as much as he did to transform English political ideology. He wrapped himself in the cloak of aristocracy and English Conservatism, and the wider public did not notice that, despite his writings and speeches, in his perspective and his disdain for other races he had continued to remain a Jew, specifically a pureblooded Jew of very exceptional qualities.

Lastly, we cannot spare criticism for the conduct of the Lords: they had in their hands the power to continue to repel the Jewish attacks. They were not defeated by the battle itself, but instead by a law which they themselves proposed, which made it possible for the Jews to achieve their longed-for objective. Never was a battle so ignominiously lost by such an illustrious assembly as the one that was lost by those Peers of England.

These 28 years of struggle in England are proof of how the Hebrews achieved emancipation, and with this emancipation, power, by all means licit and illicit. The end point could no longer be distant, once the principle had been infringed, no matter how slightly. Judah will always exploit the most trivial opportunity to consolidate its position and strengthen its influence. It may perhaps seem hard to some people that all compromise with the Jewish Question should be dismissed out of hand. But history shows us repeatedly that there is only the choice of either tolerating Jews completely or not tolerating them at all. Any deviation from this rule is the beginning of the end, and the end is the sovereignty of the Jews.

Lastly, we have to stress once more: whoever wishes to liberate England from the Jews will have to act as they do, which is to say, the path towards victory starts in London.

Even the Jewish barrister and author Henry Henriques openly states: 'The settlement [of the Jewish emancipation question] seems to be destitute of principle and innocent of logic',[404] but he believes that there was no other choice, given how intolerable the domestic political situation had become, especially in view of the fact that they could not dare to let the people decide the question. We also believe that this would have been a very dangerous option, because the English of 1858 would have voted against Jewish emancipation with a crushing majority. Nevertheless, England considered itself, and still considers itself, an especially great democracy and perhaps one day an Englishman will be able to explain the object and purpose of a democracy if the opinion of the

404 Henriques: *Jews.…*, pp. 297-300. Translator's note: Quotation reproduced verbatim from original source (p. 297).

populace is not only not counted, but decisions are made which expressly go against the populace's wishes and objectives.

The Jewish position did not take long in consolidating itself still further. The Lucan law in principle allowed the Jews to forego the final words of the oath, but for this to happen, it was necessary in each case to obtain the House's approval. This state of affairs was very disagreeable to the Jews and their supporters, since any change in political circumstance could breathe new life into the old opposition. It was crucial, then, to eradicate this danger once and for all, which could only be achieved by a new law. In 1860 a new bill was introduced to this end, which was passed without any kind of difficulty. Meanwhile – imagine, in only two years! - the adversaries of the Jews had disappeared to such an extent that barely any debate took place.[405]

Already by 1866,[406] Parliament was back to dealing with Jewish interests. It aimed to establish for all members of Parliament and the House of Lords – whatever their religion – a new common oath without the final words 'upon the true faith of a Christian' which in principle still existed.

Nor on this occasion was there an opposition worthy of mention. Disraeli directed the action and made a long speech explaining why the bill should be passed.[407] From an impossible but not disheartened position, Mr. Newdegate delivered a meticulous and impassioned speech against the bill. He accused Disraeli in particular of wishing to use this law to obtain still greater advantages for his racial kin. He also warned the House of his belief that 'this measure is intended to facilitate still greater changes, and to render these changes, by making them step by step, insensibly less unpalatable to the country, because not fully understood'.[408]

But the strength of the anti-Jewish faction had diminished so much in only eight years, that in the division they counted for only five votes against 298.

The bill was then sent, as usual, to the House of Lords, in which it was also seen that the longstanding opposition against the Jews had become a shadow of its former self. The same powerful and influential circles of interest must also have been at work in the Upper House for even the most stalwart of the old adversaries to be silenced. Even the political world's former champion for the people's cause, Sir Frederic Thesiger, latterly Lord Chelmsford, no longer maintained his resistance. He based his change of position on the fact that in past times he had maintained his opposition 'upon principle, and upon principle alone'. As in 1858 the law had been passed by the aforementioned compromise, it seemed to him that the principle had been so violated that today it was no longer worth opposing the bill. Previous laws had already swept away all of the Jewish disabilities, which meant that any opposition now would have to be looked upon as an insult to the Crown. There was practically no obstacle left to impede the Jews from entering the House of Lords, which meant that there really was 'nothing left worth contending for'. The principle, which he had defended so steadfastly in another era, had been sacrificed, which was why he no longer saw any reason to vote against the bill being read.[409]

---

405 *Hansard*, Volume 157, pp. 960-3, 1916-9; Volume 158, pp. 205, 1507, 1745-50.

406 *Hansard*, Volume 181, pp. 453-59, 1712-37; Volume 182, pp. 289-314, 480-3, 510-8, 1322-55, 1619-28, 1759, 2176.

407 *Hansard*, Volume 181, p. 1712.

408 *Hansard*, Volume 181, p. 1733. Translator's note: Quoted element reproduced verbatim from original source. Also note that I could not find Newdegate's stated charge against Disraeli within this particular speech, but as it was known that Newdegate had made a similar charge against Disraeli at least once before in Parliament (as outlined in this volume), it may be that this charge appears in another debate, and Aldag cited it here in error.

409 *Hansard*, Volume 182, 1349, 1622. Translator's note: Quoted elements reproduced verbatim from original source.

Perhaps with this speech Lord Chelmsford did not intend to justify the abandonment of his previous position, and that his actions were rather to be interpreted as a resignation to the fact there was nothing left to save. Of particular interest is his discursive pivot to any opposition being potentially seen as insult to the Crown. What a change had taken place in English life in the short space of eight years!

As can be seen, Judah had broken all resistance. How bitterly true were the words of the Earl of Clancarty when, during the one of the last debates that took place in the House of Lords in 1858 on the subject, he made the observation: ‘principles do not change and they admit of no compromise’.

One would be forgiven for thinking that with such a state of affairs, no opposition speech would be made regarding this bill. But the Marquess of Bath accused Lord Chelmsford and Lord Derby of betraying their principles, and he reminded the members of the House that they could consult Hansard to find the arguments expounded by these two men in their many speeches against the Jews. In another era Lord Derby had appealed to House to exclude the Jews from Parliament, for being outsiders in race and religion. Now the two men were unabashed in their support for the Hebrews.[410]

But the Marquess of Bath found himself quite alone, and no vote was held that was worthy of mention, a sign that there was now hardly any opposition. Judah had triumphed in England, once and for all.

What a similar change had taken place in the press! The vast majority of newspapers did not make the least mention of these events in the constituent Houses.

410 *Hansard*, Volume 182, p. 1618.

Conclusion

With the achievement of the Jews' aims in Parliament, the Jewish fight for political emancipation had come to a close, at least formally. The road was now clear for new advances in British society, advances which would be truly decisive and transcendental.

Although the preceding account of all of the various Jewish attempts to enter Parliament and the state administration of England can appear fatiguing at first glance, due to the sameness of the arguments from both sides and the stereotypical constant repetition of the same methods, this uniformity demonstrates a Jewish political will which is consistent on every point and an extreme determination to achieve political emancipation. With these events, which ended in the submission of a House of Lords which had resisted until the last moment, what is revealed is the great importance that the Jews attributed to this tactical position. Furthermore, we recognise in these facts just how deeply England had been overwhelmed and conquered – the England that is already a thing of the past. The path had been cleared not only for the removal of the last of the Jewish disabilities, but still further, for Jewish domination over England. The key that opened all doors and portals was in the hands of Jewry: the last bastion of a pure race had fallen.

The next volume of this study is dedicated to demonstrating with a terrifying clarity how Jewry recognised the value of this tactical position and, above all, how they took advantage of it. How the phrase 'Jews rule England' went, by means of the methods revealed in this study, from a slogan to a most dangerous reality. We will strive to document this reality, in all of its depravity, in the subsequent and final volume.

Translator's Appendix: A Sketch of Jewish London Life in the 1840s.

What follows is an excerpt from Chapter XVI of John Fisher Murray's *The World of London* (1843), included here to give readers a brief but vivid depiction of the earliest example of multiculturalism in England. Other facets of the writer's experience of Jewish life in London, for example, his lively observations of the Rag Fair, the Jewish Sabbath, and Jewish Sunday trading, could not be included here for reasons of space, but they are highly recommended to any reader curious to know how the legislators in Westminster may have perceived the Jewish community in England at this time of heated emancipation debates. Murray's book was originally published in 1841-2 as a series of essays in *Blackwood's Magazine*, the famous and popular literary journal, so it is very plausible that many lawmakers would have been exposed to John Fisher Murray's writing.

> …The Jewish Quarter, then, is bounded to the north by High Street, Spitalfields – to the east by Middlesex Street, popularly known and called Petticoat Lane – to the south by Leadenhall Street, Aldgate, and the hither end of Whitechapel – to the west by Bishopsgate Street. This is literally the New Jerusalem: here we Christians are foreigners, strangers in a strange land: here, over the doors, are inscribed pot-hooks and vowel points, indicative, to those who understand them, that Moses Abrahams furnisheth 'slops' for home consumption and exportation – this we naturally conclude to be the meaning from the articles exhibited in the windows; for though the sign be Hebrew to them, we need hardly say that it is *Greek* to us. Within the area bounded as above described, but especially about Bevis Marks, Houndsditch, St Mary Axe, and Petticoat Lane, you might readily imagine yourself transported to Frankfort, Warsaw, or any place enjoying a superabundant Jewish population. Here, every face is of the shape, and somewhat of the complexion, of a turkey egg; every brow pencilled in an arch of exact ellipse; every nose modelled after the proboscis of a Toucan; locks as bushy and black as those of Absalom abound, and beards of the patriarchal ages. Here, and hereabouts, Isaac kills beef and mutton according to the old dispensation: Jacob receives accidental silver spoons, and consigns gold watches, now warranted never more to lose a second, to the crucible, kept always at white heat in his little dark cellar, and *no questions asked*.
>
> Here, at the corners, Rebecca disposes of fried liver and 'tatoes, smoking hot, on little bright burnished copper platters, to all the tribes of Israel not prohibited by law to eat – that is to say, to all who possess the solitary 'brown' wherewith to purchase the appetising dainty. Solomon negotiates in the matter of rags: Esther rejoices in a brisk little business of flat fish fried in oil – a species of dainty in which the Jews alone excel; Moses and Aaron keep separate marine stores, where every earthly thing, furtively acquired, from a chain cable to a wine bottle, finds a ready sale. Rachel, albeit a widow, dispenses from behind a bar '*short*' and '*heavy*' to the thirsty tribes: Ruth deals wholesale in oranges and other foreign fruits: Melchizedek dabbleth in Hebrew books and tracts: Absalom sells opium and Turkey Rhubarb: Mordecai is a 'crimp', the vulture of seafaring men. Nothing is to be seen above, below, around, but Jewish physiognomies, Jewish houses, and Jewish occupations. The avidity with which this, in

one sense, primitive people pursues gain, is not wonderful, when we reflect that gain is all that the, till lately, unrelenting persecution of the Christian has left them to pursue: with money, in the dark days of their history, have they purchased the poor privilege to live: with money have they secured for themselves in one country connivance, in another toleration, in a third citizenship: with money have they made war, and set by the ears hostile Nazarenes: with money have they negotiated peace – transferred from king to king diadems and sceptres – playing at chuck-farthing with the fates and fortunes of European and Asiatic nations. The same all-absorbing thirst of gold that formed the leading principle in the life of that pillar of the Stock Exchange, the well-remembered Rothschild, animates the merest Israelitish urchin who follows through the streets his bearded progenitor, esquire of the clothes' bag. To the pursuit of gain all their energies are directed with an intensity, unscrupulosity, and perseverance unknown to, and unattempted by, any Christian people: money they must and will have, 'rem, *quocunque modo* rem': the lowest depths of knavery, chicanery, and extortion, are practised by some to accomplish this the end of their existence. For this the infamous 'crimp' grasps the hard earnings of the unsuspecting seaman as soon as he steps upon his native shore, and then spurns him naked into the street: for this the marine store-dealers and receivers open their seminaries of theft: for this the current coin of the realm is clipped, and ingots and sovereigns perspire: for this the pander [pimp] entraps, and the bawd [madam] opens wide the gates that lead to everlasting death, trafficking in Christian flesh for purposes worse than the worst of slavery.

We are no advocates for renewing the barbarities of the Edwards and the Henries, when a Jew's tooth was rated at a thousand pounds good and lawful moneys of our Sovereign Lord the King, or for making our friend Nasmyth extractor-general of the tusk-tax: yet we must candidly confess, that when we see the daughter of a Christian man patrolling the streets, decorated in the trumpery properties of a Jewish brothel, while the devil's dam, in the shape of a hideous Hebrew hag, follows the poor unfortunate, like the shadow of death, to clutch the wages of her shame, we really think a Christian government might, without any hazard of public odium, string up at the doors of their own dens, Mother Abrahams, Mother Isaacs, and Mother Jacobs. But, after all, perhaps it is better as it is: if this abominable traffic *must* be connived at, it is better that those should have the monopoly who have nothing in common with us, save that which the weasel has in common with its prey: those who have made a god of mammon, worshipping the golden calf with the tenfold idolatry of their fathers.

Volume 6 Bibliography

1. Abrahams, L.: ‘Sir I. L. Goldsmid and the Admission of the Jews of England to Parliament’ in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Volume IV, pp. 116-176 (1899-1901).
2. Aguilar, G.: ‘History of the Jews in England’, in *Chambers Miscellany of Useful and Entertaining Tracts*, Volume 18, Issue 153 (1847).
3. Ayerst, W.: *The Jews of the 19th Century* (1848).
4. Birks, T. R.: *Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell* (1848).
5. ‘Britannicus’ [pseudonym of David Salomons]: *The Case of Mr. Salomons, alderman elect of the ward of Aldgate* (1836).
6. Broderick, G.: *The History of England*, 12 volumes (1906).
7. Campbell, J.: *Life of the Lord Chancellors*, 8 volumes (1845-69).
8. Carlyle, T.: *The Lords and the Jews* (1853).
9. ‘Clergyman’: *A Clergyman’s Apology* (1847).
10. Coles, J.: *Observations on the Civil Disabilities* (1834).
11. Disraeli, B.: *Vivian Grey* (1826).
12. ——: *Conningsby* (1844).
13. ——: *Tancred* (1847).
14. ——: *Lord George Bentinck* (1852).
15. Edison, J. S.: *The Impossibility of Admitting Jews* (1858).
16. ——: *The Question of the Admissibility* (1859).
17. ——: *Two Supplemental Chapters* (1859).
18. Egan, C.: *The Status of the Jews in England* (1848).
19. Emanuel, C.: *A Century and a Half of Jewish History* (1910).
20. Goldsmid, A. (ed.): *Report of the Case of Miller versus Salomons, M.P.* (1852).
21. Goldsmid, F. H.: *The Arguments Advanced Against the Enfranchisement of the Jews* (1831).
22. ——: *Reply to the Arguments Advanced Against the Removal of the Remaining Disabilities of the Jews* (1848).
23. ——: *Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British Jews* (1830).
24. Graetz, H.: *Historic Parallels in Jewish History* (1888).
25. Hansard, T.: *Parliamentary Debates from the Year 1803 to the Present Time*.
26. Henriques, H.: *The Jews and the English Law* (1908).
27. Hughes, H.: *A Few Plain Thoughts* (1849).
28. Hurwitz, H.: *A Letter to Isaac L. Goldsmid* (1833).
29. ‘Israelite’: *To the Rev. J. Mackenzie* (1847).
30. *Jewish Disabilities: Views of the Question on Jewish Disabilities* (by a Clergyman of the Church of England) (1847).
31. *Journals of the House of Commons*, Volume 90.
32. Kebbel, T. E.: *Selected Speeches of the Late Right Honourable the Earl of Beaconsfield* (1882).
33. Layman, A.: *Remarks on a Letter* (1848).
34. Levason, L.: *Jewish Disabilities* (1847).
35. Levy, S.: ‘Anglo Jewish Historiography’ in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Vol. VI (1907-8).

36. Lingard, J., et al: *The History of England*, Volume II (1915).
37. Low, S.: *The History of England*, Volume 12 (1907).
38. Mackenzie, H.: *A Letter to the Parishioners* (1847).
39. Margoliouth, M.: *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, 3 volumes (1851).
40. Marks, D. W: *Memoirs of Francis Henry Goldsmid*. (1882)
41. Mills, J.: *The British Jews* (1853).
42. Montagu, B.: *A Letter to Henry Warburton* (1833).
43. ——: *A Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chichester, on the Emancipation of the Jews* (1834).
44. ——: *The Jews in Parliament* (1858).
45. Myers, M.: 'Some MS. Sidelights on Anglo-Jewish Emancipation' in *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, Vol. VI, p. 240 ff. (1908).
46. van Oven, Barnard: *Ought Baron de Rothschild to Sit in Parliament?* (1847).
47. Padley, Alfred: *An Answer to Some of the Opinions and Statements Respecting the Jews…* (1852).
48. Parishioner: *A Few Words on a Minister's Letter…* (1847)
49. Paul, A.: *A History of Modern England*, Vols. I and II (1904).
50. Picciotto, J.: *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History* (1875).
51. Pope, W. L.: *On the Removal of Jewish Disabilities* (1847).
52. Salomons, D.: *A Short Statement on behalf of His Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion* (1835).
53. ——: *Further Observations on behalf of His Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion* (1836).
54. ——: *The Case of D. Salomons, Esq. being his Address to the Court of Alderman...*(1844).
55. Shapira, J.: *The Relief of the Jewish Disabilities*. Under the direction of F. Clarke, unpublished (1935).
56. Stoughton, John: *The World a Debtor to the Jew* (1853).
57. Street, H.: *A Plea for the Removal of Jewish Disabilities* (1849).
58. *The Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volumes 75 and 86.
59. Walpole, Sir Spencer: *A History of England*, Vol. V (1878-86).
60. ——: *The History of Twenty-Five Years* (1904).
61. Wolf, L.: *Essays in Jewish History* (1934).

Newspapers

1. *Standard*.
2. *Spectator*.
3. *Daily News.*
4. *Public Ledger.*
5. *Sun*.
6. *Morning Herald.*
7. *Morning Chronicle.*
8. *Manchester Guardian.*

9. *Times.*
10. *Morning Post.*

Translator's Bibliography:

Newdegate, Charles: *Speech of C. N. Newdegate, Esq., M.P., of the Second Reading of the Oath of Abjuration (Jews) Bill. In The House of Commons, Thursday, May 1, 1851, Extracted from Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*. London: George Woodfall and Son (1851).

Pearl, Elizabeth (ed.): *Anglia Judaica, or, A History of the Jews in England, by D'Blossiers Tovey LL.D.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson (1990).

Salbstein, M. C. N.: *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: the Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828-1860*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press (1982).